



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-022
Wednesday
3 February 1988

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-022

CONTENTS

3 February 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Delegation Heads Speak at Geneva Meeting	1
Chemical Weapons on Agenda [Solovyev]	1
Further on Zagladin INF Treaty Remarks	1
Ptashnikov on Shultz' Arms Control Stance	2
NATO-Pact Delegations Consult in Vienna	3
Test Site Visits Bring 'Psychological Shift' [Bogachev]	3
Kuznetsov Takes Issue With Kissinger on Strategy [ZA RUBEZHOM No 5]	4
Economist on Implications of Disarmament [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 3 Feb]	5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Press Conference 2 Feb	6
Yeltsin Speech a 'Fabrication'	6
Malenkov Death, Burial Noted	6
Geneva Arms Talks 'Essential'	6
On Shevardnadze Speech	6
Lao-Thai Relations Viewed	7
Nuclear Test Verified	7
Border Talks Held With China	7
Rarotonga Treaty Supported	8
Remarks on CW a 'Perplexity'	8
Reagan Speech on Contra Aid Holds 'Nothing New'	8
More on 'Break Up' of Human Rights Meeting [AFP]	8
Zhukov Discusses Arms Curb Issues, Nicaragua [PRAVDA 31 Jan]	9
East-West Roundtable Held on European Security	11
UN Issues Report on Security of Missions	12
Delegate Previews UN Rights Commission Session [TRUD 31 Jan]	12
ICFTU Delegate on View of Reagan, Gorbachev [PRAVDA 26 Jan]	14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Defense Ministry Confirms Yazov-Carlucci Meeting	15
Campaign To 'Brainwash' Congress on Contra Aid	15
Opposition in Congress Noted	15
U.S. Peace Plan 'Legalizes' Israeli Occupation	15
Vasilyev Analyzes U.S Role in UN Mideast Talks	16
U.S. Presidential Election Campaign Viewed [Linnik in PRAVDA 2 Feb]	16
U.S. 'Hypocrisy' on Human Rights Issues Hit [Korionov in PRAVDA 31 Jan]	17
Higher Education Cooperation Accord Signed	18
AUCCTU Chief Receives U.S. Labor Union Group [TRUD 19 Jan]	19
Soviet-U.S. Environmental Committee Meets	19
Murakhovskiy Receives Thomas	19
Book Written by Tolkunov Reviewed	19
Comparison of Gromyko Receiving U.S. Businessman	20

China

Zhao Ziyang, Cambodia's Sihanouk Hold Talks	20
PRC Trade Delegation Arrives in Soviet Far East	20
Xiang Cited on Obstacles to U.S., USSR Ties	21

U.S. Listing of PRC as Hostile State Viewed [Shakov]	22
PRC Envoy to India on Border Issue, Trade	22

Northeast Asia

DPRK Ends Contacts on Returning U.S. Remains	22
Businessman Views Soviet-Japanese Trade Talks	22
Relations With Japan, Far East Tension Viewed [Biryukov]	23
Commentator on Announcement of Team Spirit-88	24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

PRC Urged To Open Dialogue With Vietnam	24
Increased Cooperation with ASEAN Advocated	25

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Receives Iraqi Foreign Minister	25
Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Iraqi Official	26
Meets Iraqi Parliamentarian [IZVESTIYA 3 Feb]	26
London Paper's Report [AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 26 Jan]	27
Indian Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow [IZVESTIYA 3 Feb]	27
Jordan's Al-Masri Supports Peace Proposals [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	27
Israeli CP Criticizes U.S. Mideast Peace Plan	27
Demchenko Reviews Proposals for Mideast Solution [PRAVDA 2 Feb]	28
UN's Cordovez Kabul Airport Address Reported [IZVESTIYA 3 Feb]	30
Unlabeled Free Aid Not Credited by Afghans [PRAVDA 31 Jan]	30
Indian Satellite to be Launched at Baykonur	31
Gorbachev 'Likely' To Visit India in Nov [Delhi PATRIOT 10 Jan]	31

East Europe

Urban on Public Reaction to Price Increases	31
Poland's Messner Receives Broadcasting Official	31
Briefs	32
Hungarian-Soviet Cultural Cooperation	32

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro on Cuban Tasks in 'Correcting Mistakes' [PRAVDA 30 Jan]	32
Contras 'Infiltrated' by CIA Attack Village	32
More on Contra-Sandinist Cease-Fire Talks	33
Nicaragua's Tinoco Comments	33
Contras Follow 'Hard Line' [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	33
Nicaraguan 'Group of 14' Refuses To Resume Talks	34
Alleged Recording of Kidnapped Colonel Released	34

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Possible Nuclear Reactor Accident Reported	35
Reaction to 'Follow Shortly' [DPA]	35
Reports 'Unfounded'	35
Gremitskikh Denies Story [DPA]	35
Toxic Spill Clean-Up Continues; 34 Hospitalized	35
Belorussian Central Committee Plenum Reported [Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 23 Jan]	35
Criminal Distributes Leaflets for Nationalists	36
Estonian Arrested for Not Answering Summons [AFP]	36
VOA Analysis of PRAVDA Editorial Challenged [PRAVDA 1 Feb]	37

'Extremely High' Crime Level Reported	41
Law Bans Consideration of Anonymous Complaints	41
Line Outside Liquor Store Photographed [IZVESTIYA 23 Jan]	42
Arrangements for 1989 Census Outlined [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Jan]	42
Civil Aviation Official Interviewed on Aeroflot [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Feb]	44
Commercial Fishing Banned in Sea of Azov	45
Reform of Technical-Vocational Schools Viewed	45
Viewers Discuss Restructuring, Literature	46
OGONEK Article on Young Writers Criticized [PRAVDA 29 Jan]	47

Economic

Letters on Discipline, Approaches of Reforms [IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]	48
---	----

Agricultural

Ligachev Addresses Stockraising Seminar [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 Jan]	50
Agrarian Economist's Anniversary Marked [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Feb]	53
Media Report 28-31 Jan Agricultural Developments	55

Military

Kurkotkin, Others on 'Beneficial' Restructuring [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]	55
--	----

Delegation Heads Speak at Geneva Meeting

LD022015 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Geneva February 2 TASS—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

A regular session of the conference on disarmament opened in the Geneva Palace of Nations today. The international community expects from the conference on disarmament that its work will be intensified and practical results will be enhanced in the months ahead.

Opening the first meeting, chairman of the conference in the current month Harald Rose of the GDR emphasized that as the events of the recent month showed, there are real opportunities for altering the situation and setting the trends in international relations toward the consolidation of security and peace. The results of the Soviet-American meeting in Washington showed, specifically, that the logic of the arms race can be overcome by common sense. The world public comes increasingly to realise that joint actions are needed to bring closer the day when nuclear balancing on the brink of disaster will be ended once and for all.

Speaking at the meeting, Czechoslovakia's foreign minister Bohuslav Chnoupek set out the proposals to intensify the work of the conference as they were formulated by the Prague meeting of the foreign ministers committee of the Warsaw treaty member states late in October last year. He said that qualitatively new efforts must be made here in Geneva to achieve concrete arrangements that would ensure incessant process of disarmament. This would be promoted by gradual transformation of the conference into a permanent universal body of talks and by a number of other practical measures. At particularly important periods it would be useful to hold the conference's meetings at the level of foreign ministers to give the necessary impetus toward overcoming fundamental difficulties and taking decisive steps.

Many speakers who took floor on the first day named as a priority item on the agenda the conclusion of the drafting of a convention on chemical weapons. Chairman of the special committee on chemical weapons of the conference on disarmament, Rolf Ekeus of Sweden, said that this call has been made by the latest session of the United Nations General Assembly. He submitted a report on the results of the committee's work over the recent month.

Emphasizing the pressing nature of the drafting of the appropriate convention, head of the USSR delegation Yuriy Nazarkin pointed out that the Soviet side offered a complete enough view of the system of its chemical weapons and declared its stock of chemical weapons which does not surpass 50 thousand tons of toxic agents. The United States has not done so. Moreover, it has

decided to start the production of binary chemical weapons, which does not go together with the nascent process of confidence-building in the area, he said.

Chemical Weapons on Agenda

OW030613 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0125 GMT 3 Feb 88

[Commentary by Vsevolod Solovyev; from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] The spring session of the disarmament conference opened in Geneva on 2 February. Our commentary:

[Solovyev] Hello comrades. Forty countries, including the Soviet Union, are participating in this disarmament conference. The problem of banning chemical weapons is the main question on the agenda of the session that opened today. Multilateral talks on the banning and disposal of this type of weapon of mass destruction have been going on for several years within the framework of the Geneva conference. At the last round of talks—held in January—international conventions on the universal and complete ban of chemical weapons and the elimination of stockpiles and the industrial base for their manufacture were further coordinated.

Quite recently, the majority of the delegates agreed that most of the serious obstacles, be they military or political in nature, to the adoption the convention have been eliminated. However, the prospects for a successful completion of the talks have now decreased noticeably. This is related, above all, to the U.S. position.

Toward the end of last year Washington began manufacturing binary weapons, which belong to a new generation of chemical weapons. By this action the United States introduced yet another dimension to the chemical arms race and, for all intents and purposes, sabotaged the talks.

The proposed convention was possible only under the condition that binary weapons would be declared illegal, along with any other chemical weapon that exists today or may exist in the future. Many of the delegates feel the convention draft could be prepared in the near future so the UN General Assembly's special disarmament session—scheduled for the end of May—can examine it ready it for signing. But this depends on all the participants of the talks—the United States most all.

Further on Zagladin INF Treaty Remarks

LD021950 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 2 Feb 88

[Text] [Announcer] We now report on the briefing on the ratification process of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The gathering was addressed by Comrade Zagladin, Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Here is what he said inter alia:

[Begin Zagladin recording] I must say that in essence the process of work leading to ratification of the agreement has already begun. The USSR Council of Ministers, having discussed the treaty, referred it for consideration to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet referred the treaty for the judgment of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A joint session of the commissions will take place at the beginning of next week. Deputies and members of the commission are currently studying the documents. It is envisaged that the first session will be devoted to hearing a report on the treaty, followed by a short debate to define the process of further consideration and discussion of this treaty. The commission intends to decide itself how this process will take place, but deputies have proposed that some kind of committee or subcommission of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies will probably need to be set up to familiarize itself in detail with the texts of the documents, the treaty itself, and its addenda. Naturally the commission can invite various independent experts, scientists, specialists, and various representatives of public opinion circles to participate in its work, to hear all existing opinions and points of view.

After the completion of the work of this subcommittee or subcommission, whatever it is called, I do not know yet, it will report on its work to the full membership of the two commissions, which will then hold a thorough discussion, based on the conclusions of the working group. Subsequently, depending on what decision is made, I am convinced ratification of the treaty will be proposed. The commissions will then convey their views again to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which will then hear reports from the foreign minister, defense minister, and in conclusion from the Foreign Affairs Commissions and will then make a final decision. [end recording]

[Announcer] Comrade Zagladin added that despite the generally positive mood among deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet toward the document, which they consider exceptionally important, the deputies intend to thoroughly consider it in detail, calling on independent experts. The debates will be held in February.

Ptashnikov on Shultz' Arms Control Stance
LD020030 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 1 Feb 88

[Text] [Announcer] Information agencies have reported that the U.S. secretary of state has appeared on an ABC news program, and his interview was devoted chiefly to the White House's policy on arms control. I'll ask international affairs commentator Andrey Ptashnikov to talk about this in more detail.

[Ptashnikov] I am not going to retell in detail what Shultz spoke about, but I'll stop on what was most important. First of all, he again came out in favor of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Shorter-Range Missiles. Talking about as yet unsolved, but priority tasks at talks with the Soviet Union Shultz named the following: concluding an agreement to cut strategic arms by one-half; overcoming the imbalance in conventional arms; and, finally, a general ban on chemical arms, for which, as Shultz asserted, the United States is striving with all its might.

[Announcer] I don't think we can disagree as far as the first two points go, but as for the other two—I mean, conventional and chemical weapons—I think these are causing confusion and clearly need an explanation.

[Ptashnikov] Of course. Fabrications as to the advantage of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries in general over the NATO member states in conventional weapons are far from new, and they are stubbornly continuing to be disseminated in spite of the fact that it has already been proven and acknowledged, even by many Western experts, that there is an approximate parity. In addition, the Soviet Union has, on more than one occasion, stated its readiness to discuss and deal with all possible problems in this sphere. If it were not for the stance of the United States themselves and their allies, I think it would already have been done. The same applies to chemical weapons. What White House desire for their general ban can be talked about if the United States has quite recently set about producing binary weapons, a new and barbaric type of chemical ammunition?

Incidentally, in Geneva tomorrow, the spring session of the conference on disarmament starts, and banning chemical weapons will be the main question on its agenda.

[Announcer] I'd like to come back to the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Shorter-Range Missiles. As is well-known, debates on its ratification are now underway in the U.S. Congress, and I think the legislators should in voting, pay heed to the view of the U.S. public. You were in Washington when the treaty was signed there. What is the attitude to it of ordinary Americans?

[Ptashnikov] As positive as it could be. In the course of my journalistic activity, I have talked to more than 30 Americans if not more, what's more, of different ages, skin color, and social position. Not one, I repeat, not one of them was against the treaty. Incidentally, the correctness of these conclusions have been confirmed by opinion surveys carried out later. The results of the latest were published last night. These show that 79% of Americans approve of the treaty. Also extremely indicative is the fact that more than 80% of those in the poll, believe it extremely important that the USSR and the U.S. also sign an agreement to reduce strategic offensive weapons. In conclusion, I'd like in turn to come back to

U.S. Secretary of State Shultz' interview. I think that all the questions he touched on in it, will also be discussed during his meeting with Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister. According to the preliminarily reached accord, this will take place in Moscow on 21-23 February of this year.

NATO-Pact Delegations Consult in Vienna
*LD011320 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT
1 Feb 88*

[Text] Vienna February 1 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations of Warsaw treaty and NATO countries to work out the mandate of the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The meeting studied the key question of the subject of the talks.

The delegations of the USSR and other socialist countries stressed that armed forces, conventional armaments and equipment, including dual-purpose hardware, should be subject to future reductions. It was stressed that the attempts by NATO countries to keep this hardware out of the framework of the talks contradict the task of establishing a balance of forces at reduced levels. The dual-purpose hardware is a component part of the potential intended for sneak attack and the conduct of large-scale offensive actions. The share of these types of armaments—tactical strike aviation, tactical missiles, artillery—in the military arsenals is constantly growing. To withdraw the dual-purpose hardware from the subject of the talks is tantamount to opening the floodgates for an uncontrolled arms race in Europe.

The Soviet delegation drew attention to the proposal made by the Soviet foreign minister during his recent visit to the FRG. The crux of this proposal is to study the question of dual-purpose delivery vehicles at future talks while making the nuclear component as such the subject of relevant talks in the future. The delegations of socialist countries said that this proposal offers a real chance to reach agreement on the most complex question of the mandate of the talks.

Test Site Visits Bring 'Psychological Shift'
*LD030120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1900 GMT 2 Feb 88*

[TASS military observer Bogachev commentary]

[Text] As has been reported, a delegation of Soviet experts has returned from the United States. The delegation visited the U.S. nuclear testing ground in Nevada at the end of January. Earlier, U.S. experts had visited the Soviet testing ground near the city of Semipalatinsk. What are the aims and results of these reciprocal trips?

Here is Vladimir Bogachev, Tass Observer on military matters, at the microphone:

[Bogachev] The aim of these familiarization trips was to provide a practical foundation for conducting a joint experiment on perfecting inspection measures which are necessary for the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty of 1972 on the limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons and of the 1976 treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The leaders of the delegations of both countries have unanimously noted that the exchange of visits took place in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation and contributed to the improvement of understanding in the sphere of practical problems dealing with preparations for the joint experiment.

In Nevada the Soviet experts familiarized themselves with the organization and conducting of works on the test site. The Americans showed our experts equipment for determining the strength of a nuclear blast by means of the kartext system. Neither in Nevada nor on the site near Semipalatinsk were nuclear blasts carried out during the visits. The leader of the U.S. delegation which visited the Soviet test site noted at a news conference that the Russians had given the U.S. experts all the necessary information.

Some U.S. newspapers said the exchange of visits was an unprecedented historic event. Without exaggerating the importance of this exchange, I would like to note a certain psychological shift in the relations between the two countries. Mutual trust, which is so necessary for conducting arms control talks, is strengthening. At the same time, I wish to note that the delegations of the two countries emphasized different things in their assessment of the process that has started. It seems that the differences in what the sides stressed reflect the fact that their approaches to the problem of a comprehensive and full ban of nuclear tests is not yet the same.

The Soviet side considers that the reciprocal trips to test grounds are above all the first necessary step on the path of limiting the number and strength of nuclear test blasts; say down to three or four nuclear blasts a year, of a kilotonne each. This step, the Soviet side stresses, ultimately pursues the goal of putting a stop to and banning the blasts completely. The Soviet scientists stressed that it is necessary to sustain the continuity and consistency of the process that has started until this main goal is attained.

The U.S. State Department, on the other hand, focuses attention on preparing and holding the joint experiment and virtually goes no further. The State Department is far more vague when it talks about further tasks of the countries in nuclear explosions. It is manifestly exaggerating difficulties in concluding a treaty on the full and comprehensive banning of nuclear tests. In the meantime, according to the view of competent experts, in the wide range of arms control measures the banning of blasts is even now one of the most simple and most viable tasks. The main meaning of reciprocal trips to test sites and of the forthcoming experiment is the full

banning of nuclear tests. This ban would then become an effective barrier on the path to creating new and modernizing old systems of mass destruction.

Kuznetsov Takes Issue With Kissinger on Strategy

PM031234 [Editorial report] Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 5, 29 January-4 February 1988, carries on page 7 a full-page feature consisting of a LOS ANGELES TIMES article by Henry Kissinger and a commentary by G. Kuznetsov. The 1,800-word Kissinger article, carried under the heading "Revelations of an 'Antagonist,' or What the Former U.S. Secretary of State Did Not Dare Say to M.S. Gorbachev," explains Kissinger's position on the Reykjavik proposals, his view of the prospects for world developments by the year 2000, and the preconditions for progress in Soviet-U.S. relations and the development of a coherent strategy for Soviet and U.S. foreign policy. The commentary by V. Kuznetsov, headed "New Strategy in the Old Style," reads as follows:

"Cunning, skilled in international affairs, not short of ideas, and able to wield a pen, Kissinger often writes in the press, preaching the 'hawkish' view. This time he has published in the LOS ANGELES TIMES an article pretentiously headed 'Gorbachev Welcomes an Antagonist,' seeking to enhance his own value even with the headline.

"If you pick out the nub of the matter, discarding the garish veneer of verbosity, it is not hard to perceive that the whole thrust of the article is directed first and foremost at creating an atmosphere of distrust toward steps taken by the Soviet leadership, which, in the spirit of the new thinking, is pursuing a policy of strengthening peace and ensuring the peoples' security and cooperation; at discrediting Reykjavik, which, as is well-known, led to a recognition of the need for nuclear disarmament; at undermining the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-range Missiles, under which missiles of two classes are to be eliminated; and at thwarting any steps in the disarmament sphere.

"Like the most inveterate anti-Sovietists, Kissinger continues to preach the pseudothesis of the military threat supposedly emanating from the USSR, and is not afraid to repeat the old fables about the Soviet Union's 'desire' for world domination. As if in passing, he lets fall a phrase about the West's so-called laggardness in conventional arms, and it does not worry him that only recently Senator C. Levin published a documentary study which rejects outright that lie, which is so convenient for the military-industrial complex. Kissinger needs this phrase to 'substantiate' another argument—about the 'need' to retain the 'nuclear deterrent.' He raises the question of conventional arms solely to come out in favor of increasing them, or at least to prevent their reduction.

"It would be a mistake, however, to study the views set forth by Kissinger in his article outside the context of the document headed 'Discriminate Deterrence'—a report

by a special commission for the elaboration of recommendations on long-term U.S. strategy, in which he played by no means the least role.

"In this plan for a 'comprehensive, long-term strategy' there is an admission that reflects reality: In future it will not be expedient to rely on nuclear weapons as a means of waging war, since their use will lead to self-destruction. Logic would appear to demand the conclusion that M.S. Gorbachev is right to advocate their elimination. But—alas!—the conclusion is the opposite: The recommendation is to rely on nuclear weapons (including improved British and French forces), high-precision conventional weapons (the next generation of so-called 'smart' types of armaments), and strategic defense. To avoid, on the face of it, coming into blatant conflict with the premise of the all-destroying might of nuclear weapons, it is proposed that they be miniaturized and made ultraprecise. Then it would supposedly be possible to exchange 'pinpricks' without making the nuclear conflict universal. As if that was not a deliberate deception! Moreover the authors of the strategy also work on the basis of the idea of substituting for nuclear warheads conventional, high-precision, small-size warheads, clearly counting on the superiority of U.S. technology, although that assumption has repeatedly been debunked. The target of the strikes is the second and third echelons of the Warsaw Pact forces.

"An ever increasing role is assigned to 'smart' weapons. This cannot but inspire the thought that in a situation where the discussion is of reducing and eliminating whole classes of nuclear arms, the creators of the U.S. strategy of the future are thinking about a new buildup in the arsenals of death, but at a higher level, which would guarantee profits for the military monopolies.

"The fact that the creators of the new strategy have not abandoned the old plans for encircling the Soviet Union is indicated by the following statement: 'The threat to the United States must be rebuffed not on America's borders, but on our enemies' borders.' They emphasize the need for the United States to create and strengthen military bases and material-technical support bases throughout the 'Third World,' above all in regions adjacent to USSR territory, to 'strengthen' NATO's north and south flanks, and also to step up aid to the allies and the conduct of secret operations. It is proposed to allocate 4% of GNP, or \$12 billion, as a one-time payment to eliminate 'low intensity conflicts' in the U.S. interest. That means stepping up aid to the Afghan dushmans, the Nicaraguan 'contras,' the Duarte regime, and so forth. That is what lies behind the formula about resolving political problems!

"Moreover, the document 'Discriminate Deterrence' and the article often 'overlap.' Thus they proceed on the basis that the West European countries could refuse to go along with Uncle Sam in implementing plans for the arms race, and could even make 'separate deals with

Moscow.' Therefore they try to intimidate them with the imaginary danger supposedly inherent in disarmament and in 'decoupling' from the United States.

"Setting forth various conditions for talks on particular aspects of disarmament and claiming that nonnuclear weapons cannot prevent war, Kissinger makes out that mankind has no alternative. That is a deliberate fraud on the part of a politician who knows about the socialist countries' plan for creating a comprehensive system of international security, which, incidentally, was approved by a majority of the United Nations. That system will work with any correlation of forces in the world arena."

Economist on Implications of Disarmament

PM031014 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 3 Feb 88 p 9

[Interview with Candidate of Economic Sciences V.M. Krivosheyev, sector chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, by our correspondent Vladimir Kuznetsov under the rubric "Expert Opinion": "The Economics of Disarmament?"—date and place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Disarmament problems are ceasing to be the sole prerogative of politicians. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-range Missiles which was signed and the intention of the Soviet and U.S. leaders to sign a treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic nuclear arsenals will release vast material, human, and financial resources. The process of switching the military industry onto a peaceful footing is today becoming a serious economic problem. Candidate of Economic Sciences V.M. Krivosheyev, sector chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, spoke of this in a conversation with our correspondent Vladimir Kuznetsov.

[Kuznetsov] Vladlen Mikhaylovich, you use the term "the economics of disarmament"—is it not premature to say that?

[Krivosheyev] The fact is that the rate of development of the military sector is now twice the rate of development of the world economy as a whole.

What does this mean? Take one of the most urgent problems, housing. With the \$800 billion spent by the world military industry in 1985 (and by 1990 that figure will almost double), you could build about 20 million fashionable apartments of 100 square meters each. Well-appointed apartments, equipped to the world's best standards. In 10 years all the Europeans could move into such apartments. In 20 years, all the Europeans and Americans; in 30 years, all the Europeans, Americans, and Africans. All of them, let me emphasize, into new housing.

Today's problems are even more acute for the many millions of homeless and unemployed....

[Kuznetsov] Yet the view exists that the military industry, on the contrary, increases employment?

[Krivosheyev] That is a delusion. In the United States itself the Bureau of Labor Statistics has produced calculations showing that two jobs in the U.S. military industry crowd out three jobs in sectors producing consumer goods, or four jobs in the health service, or eight jobs in education. In a word, jobs which devour assets crowd out jobs which create assets. This is explained by the fact that military production takes place in relatively capital-intensive sectors, and the production of output for peaceful purposes in relatively labor-intensive sectors. Moreover every year the former becomes more and more capital-intensive, and that means a still greater reduction in jobs. Statistics show that countries spending the largest sums on military purposes also hold the top places in unemployment. This also happens because of the direct diversion of funds for military needs from social programs, as in the United States, for instance.

[Kuznetsov] And in the Soviet Union?

[Krivosheyev] Naturally, this does considerable damage to our country, too. Many socioeconomic problems could be resolved were it not for the forced diversion of resources for the arms race. In the late fifties the Soviet Union unilaterally reduced its Armed Forces by 1.2 million men. This made it possible to build 100 major house building combines. In a comparatively short space of time housing construction was doubled in the country and the old-age pension was doubled.

But if the world goes down the path that has been mapped out, then a different problem will certainly arise, a problem affecting the lives of millions of people. Only economists can help to resolve it in practice. We can therefore assume now that special economic knowledge will be required, perhaps a whole sector of such knowledge, studying the problems of transforming and switching military industry to peaceful industry. General laws of some kind will probably be deduced, irrespective of the country where this is taking place, as well as peculiarities for each country individually. It seems to me the time has come to raise the question of forming this new sector of knowledge—the economics of disarmament.

What, for instance, will a plant that has been engaged in the production of missiles do? I can imagine that an enterprise involved in chemical arms production could quite easily be transferred, say, to the production of chemical fertilizers. But for a plant making tanks, apart from the trivial idea that it could produce tractors, my imagination will go no farther. We need special knowledge, a combination of sector specialist economists and theoretical economists. A new field of activity could spring up from here, and perhaps a new movement—"economists for disarmament," for instance....

Gerasimov Holds Press Conference 2 Feb

Yeltsin Speech a 'Fabrication'

LD021952 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said today, replying to a TASS correspondent's question concerning the publication of what the French newspaper LE MONDE presented as Boris Yeltsin's speech at the October 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee (in its February 2 edition), that Yeltsin said nothing of the kind at the plenum.

"This publication is nothing but a fabrication," Gerasimov added.

"It's strange that the editorial board of the paper, itself expressing doubts about the authenticity of the text, still published it," he said.

Malenkov Death, Burial Noted

LD021414 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 (TASS)—Replying to a question Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing here today that Georgiy Malenkov died on January 14 this year.

The former member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers from March 1953 to February 1955 was buried at a Moscow cemetery on January 19.

Geneva Arms Talks 'Essential'

LD021528 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—"It is important to advance consistently the multilateral process of disarmament in all areas," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing here today in connection with the start of the session of the Geneva conference on disarmament today.

"The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles made the beginning for real nuclear disarmament," said the Soviet spokesman.

"The disarmament conference is to play an essential independent role in promoting the process of disarmament. It is called upon to become forum which would internationalize the efforts to building a nuclear weapon-free non-violent world."

Banning chemical weapons was especially topical among issues on the session's agenda, Gerasimov observed. The drafting of the text of a corresponding convention was nearing completion. The Soviet Union would apply maximum effort, the spokesman said, so that the convention be signed as soon as possible.

"The non-constructive stand of the United States which has resumed the production of chemical weapons hinders and complicates the talks. One can also draw attention to the stance taken by France which still insists that the convention do not ban the development of chemical weapons.

"France is opposed to the declaration of all places of storing chemical weapons and the establishment of full international control over them immediately on the entry into force of the convention."

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that "the biggest part of the session will be held prior to the opening of the 3rd special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament."

"Successful work of the conference may effectively facilitate constructive discussion at the special session of the entire complex of disarmament issues."

On Shevardnadze Speech

LD021602 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—"By starting the publication of the VESTNIK MID SSSR (bulletin of the USSR Foreign Ministry), we hoped it would benefit not only diplomats, but also journalists.

We don't wish, however, the bulletin to damage us, the publishers. So our request is: Don't read between the lines," a Soviet foreign ministry spokesman today commented on a CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR columnist's remarks concerning Eduard Shevardnadze's speech published in the bulletin.

The remarks, picked up by the Voice of America radio station, claimed that the Soviet leadership pinned no hopes for enhancing the efficiency of its economy on cooperation with the socialist countries.

"I looked through that speech by the Soviet foreign ministry," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said, "and I found nothing that would justify, even in part, remarks of that kind in the American paper.

In fact, the minister pointed out that the Soviet Union continued to give top priority in its foreign economic ties to relations with member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance."

The BBC radio station had gone even further in distorting facts, Gerasimov said. It claimed that Shevardnadze, during his visit to Spain, began to dictate defence policy to the European NATO countries.

In reality, he called for the concerted search for ways to further reduce arms in Europe and to build trust."

Lao-Thai Relations Viewed

LD021517 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 (TASS)—A verbal representation was made on Monday at the USSR Foreign Ministry to the Thai Ambassador Prajit Rojanaphruk, a briefing today was told by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"Serious concern is being expressed in the Soviet Union in connection with the growth of tension as a result of the unceasing incidents on the Thai-Lao border", the Soviet foreign ministry spokesman said. "A further escalation of hostilities can bring about not only a drastic worsening of relations between Thailand and Laos but is also fraught with an aggravation of the situation in the whole of Southeast Asia".

The present border incident is the more regrettable that it is happening at a time when a real prospect has appeared for a settlement of the existing problems in that area by political means, Gerasimov said further. "We are convinced that this situation, which is largely a vestige of the colonial division of Indochina, should be resolved exclusively by political means at the negotiating table", he said further. "The Soviet Union is confident that both countries will display political realism and good will and will be able to peacefully resolve the incident".

In the USSR's opinion the recent proposal by the Lao Government to solve the existing problems between Thailand and Laos by way of talks in accordance with the principles of equality and without preliminary conditions creates a good basis for the resumption of the dialogue between the two countries.

"The hope is expressed in the Soviet Union that the Government of Thailand, acting in the spirit of the long-standing traditions of friendship and goodneighbourhood between the two countries, will take steps that will facilitate the solution of the existing problems between Thailand and Laos by way of talks. This is what the ambassador was told. He replied that he would immediately inform the Government of Thailand of the views expressed by the Soviet side and assured that his government would take steps to resolve this conflict by peaceful means", the Soviet foreign ministry spokesman said.

Nuclear Test Verified

LD021443 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—"In connection with the U.S. side's statement concerning the nuclear test conducted in the Soviet Union on December 13, 1987, the USSR Embassy in Washington has confirmed that an explosion with a yield of 20 to 150 kilotons was carried out during the test, as was reported in the respective TASS announcement", Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated at a briefing today.

"Since the United States expressed a supposition that the yield of the explosion could exceed the 150 kiloton threshold, the national verification service of the USSR carried out an additional verification of the circumstances connected with the December 13 test. This was done not because the Soviet Union had any doubts about the correctness of the issued data but exclusively in the spirit of goodwill and respect for the viewpoint of the partner."

"The verification showed that the yield of the explosion could not and actually did not exceed the 150 kiloton threshold", the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry went on to say. "This was recorded by both all technical verification means and by seismic equipment installed at a large distance from the test site. Thereby, as we see it, the effectiveness of seismic methods of determining the yield is confirmed once again".

"As for the assertion contained in the U.S. statement that the Soviet Union ostensibly gives up the strict observance of the accords on limiting the yield of tests, we resolutely reject it," the spokesman emphasized.

"Such kind of far-fetched assertions are the more inappropriate in the situation when talks are being actively conducted between the Soviet Union and the United States on limiting and ending nuclear tests, the talks which enter a decisive stage of preparation for a joint test verifying experiment."

Border Talks Held With China

LD021342 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—"Experts of the working group on border issues between the USSR and China held meetings and sessions in Moscow from January 20 to February 1," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said that the "Soviet and Chinese representatives started specific discussion of the issue of the eastern section of the border between the two countries."

"The discussion was held in an atmosphere of business-like cooperation. It will be continued at the next meeting to be held in Beijing in April."

Rarotonga Treaty Supported

*LD021411 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT
2 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 2 (TASS)—"The ratification by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the protocols Nos 2 and 3 to the treaty on the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, the Rarotonga Treaty, is evidence that the Soviet Union consistently comes out for the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world", a briefing here today was told by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"The USSR views such zones as an important measure of lessening the danger of nuclear war, reducing the geographic sphere of nuclear preparations, strengthening the regime of nuclear-non-proliferation and creating a climate of trust and security on the regional level. There is no doubt that this would facilitate the process of banishing nuclear weapons", he said.

"The Soviet Union hopes that all member countries of the South Pacific forum will accede to the Rarotonga Treaty and calls on the nuclear powers which have not yet done this to come out as guarantors of the treaty by signing and ratifying the relevant protocols to the treaty", Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed.

Remarks on CW a 'Perplexity'

*LD021613 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT
2 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow January 2 TASS—Perplexity was caused in the Soviet Union by a recent statement of British Secretary of State for Defence George Younger that, allegedly, there are no signs of the Soviet Union's readiness to take any steps to reduce the production of chemical weapons, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing here today.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman recalled that on April 10, 1987, the Soviet Union announced the termination of the production of chemical weapons. "If aides have not informed Younger of that, I shall have to perform that job for them and repeat that the Soviet Union declares for an early conclusion of a convention on the comprehensive ban and elimination of chemical weapons. This was emphasised once again during Mikhail Gorbachev's recent conversation with Margaret Thatcher. It is precisely the Soviet Union that by its latest steps—announcement of the termination of the production of chemical weapons, invitation of foreign

experts to Shikhan, the declaration of its stocks of chemical weapons—has created a favourable climate for completing the drafting of the convention", Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

Britain's contribution to the drafting of the convention on banning chemical weapons is noted with satisfaction in the USSR, he said. "And even though the activity of British diplomacy at the talks in Geneva started declining somewhat of late, it is hoped in the USSR that Britain will make a positive contribution toward ridding humankind of the threat of chemical weapons".

Reagan Speech on Contra Aid Holds 'Nothing New'

*LD030825 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT
3 Feb 88*

[Text] Washington February 3 TASS—In a desperate attempt at saving the administration's request for the granting of additional aid to the contras, which is clearly doomed to a failure, President Reagan issued a special address to the nation from the Oval Office on Tuesday.

The address, which all the three biggest U.S. television companies refused to telecast through their channels, was some kind of a finale in the intensive campaign carried out by the White House in recent weeks to mastermind the vacillating law-makers less than twenty-four hours before the voting in the House of Representatives scheduled for Wednesday. Yet Reagan's new address contained nothing new as a matter of fact and reduced to the idea that only a continuation of military pressure on Managua could lead to ensuring a ceasefire in Nicaragua.

More on 'Break Up' of Human Rights Meeting

*AU312042 Paris AFP in English 2003 GMT
31 Jan 88*

[Text] Moscow, Jan 31 (AFP)—Police tried to break up a meeting in a Moscow flat Sunday between some 70 Soviet human rights activists and visiting members of an international human rights federation, a dissident source said.

About 10 uniformed officers and KGB men burst into the apartment where the Soviet activists were meeting with members of the Vienna-based International Helsinki Federation, Aleksandr Rubchenko, member of an illegal pacifist group said.

The police ordered those present to leave the apartment under threat of arrest, but when they refused to do so, the officers blocked the doorway to stop late-comers from joining the gathering. Mr Rubchenko told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

He said the officers noted the names of all the Soviet nationals present and briefly detained some of them.

The IHF delegation arrived here a week ago at the invitation of the Soviet authorities. The IHF was set up in 1982 to monitor the application of the 1975 Helsinki Accords.

Meanwhile Estonian nationalist Heki Ahonen was severely beaten up Saturday in a street in the Estonian capital Tallinn, a French television journalist said in Paris.

Mr. Ahonen had a bag taken from him containing a list of people supporting the construction of a memorial to victims of Stalinism, said Noel Mamere, producer of the French television series *Resistances*, to whom Mr Ahonen had given an interview in December.

Police refused to allow Mr Ahonen to lodge a complaint about the attack, in which his aunt, who was walking with him, was also beaten.

Zhukov Discusses Arms Curb Issues, Nicaragua *PM021501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 88* *Second Edition p 4*

[Yuriy Zhukov "International Review": "The World Last Week"]

[Text] Another week brimful, in a manner of speaking, with important events has passed. In Moscow and Washington the process of the ratification of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was set in motion. In Geneva talks continued on the reduction of strategic offensive arms and ways to prevent the militarization of space. In Vienna consultations resumed with a view to preparing talks on the reduction of arms and armed forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Finally, throughout this week, intensive bilateral contacts were held between the governments of a whole series of countries.

The content and even the course of all these meetings is by no means clear-cut. But on the whole, they mirrored in different ways two basic concepts of international relations, two approaches to solving crucial and pressing problems—that is to say, they mirrored the clash between the new and the old thinking.

Let us reflect on the events of the past 7 days.

Two Strategies [subhead]

Last Monday was a "big day"—as the Americans put it—in the U.S. Senate. President R. Reagan delivered the latest "State of the Union" address in the Senate. A few hours earlier he had officially submitted the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles for examination by the Senate. Immediately the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees embarked on debating the two documents.

The U.S. President, the secretary of state, the defense secretary, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff spoke in support of the treaty. The head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, M. Kampelman, assured the senators that "all European countries, all major political parties, and all political leaders—both members and nonmembers of NATO country governments—resolutely support the treaty."

"From the treaty on intermediate nuclear forces," R. Reagan said in his "State of the Union" address, "it is only a short step to an even more important agreement—an agreement on the reduction of strategic arms...."

Everything seems to be going very smoothly. However, reading all these important statements, I could not but recall another report by the U.S. President to Congress, the report on "national security strategy" which was submitted the week before. There, in black and white, you can read that "the Soviet Union continues to present the most serious threat to U.S. national interests." Furthermore, the President tried to persuade Congress that allegedly this mythical threat "has intensified" and that "certain results achieved of late in the cause of the revision of the military and geopolitical balance are in jeopardy." Hence his demand for the further buildup of military expenditure which, incidentally, is also reflected in the "State of the Union" address.

Here I must add that U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci in his speech to the Armed Services Committee stated last Monday that the NATO bloc "must proceed with the modernization of its nuclear forces and increase their viability"; it must, for instance, proceed with the development of systems to replace the Lance nuclear missiles currently deployed in five West European countries and air-to-surface missiles and modernize nuclear-capable artillery systems. (The British newspaper *THE GUARDIAN* wrote on Friday: "NATO is planning to deploy 2-3 times more nuclear cruise missiles than the number of missiles eliminated under the INF Treaty and a further 1,000 new tactical nuclear missiles and projectiles").

All this cannot but alarm the people who recall repeated statements by U.S. leaders that the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles must be followed up with further measures on nuclear disarmament on an even larger scale.

Clearly not by accident, even the very conservative West German newspaper *WELT AM SONNTAG* deemed it necessary last Sunday to warn that such a duplicitous policy on the part of the U.S. Administration is bound to cause confusion and difficulties inside NATO.

Europe Confronted With a Choice [subhead]

In these circumstances, the leaders of European states are currently working out what stance they should adopt in the new situation that has developed after the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and

Shorter-Range Missiles. This was the dominant theme during important bilateral interstate contacts that took place last week, and it was the key topic of deliberations by public representatives.

In particular, the peoples of the two German states, the GDR and the FRG, on whose border the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact face each other, have a vital interest in seeing the mountains of nuclear weapons stockpiled in Europe removed as quickly as possible.

The question of the prospects for nuclear disarmament in Europe was discussed in detail during the past week during the official friendly visit to the USSR by GDR Foreign Minister O. Fischer and also during the meeting in Prague between FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and Czechoslovak Premier L. Strougal. Both in Moscow and Prague, the sides taking part in the talks emphasized the importance of the INF Treaty and expressed themselves in favor of the continuation and expansion of the process of disarmament.

The USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR have decided to make a new substantial contribution to the cause of nuclear disarmament: In accordance with the decision adopted at the Berlin conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee 11 December, within the near future—even before the INF Treaty comes into force—the withdrawal of Soviet missiles sited on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia is to go ahead.

The participants in the Moscow talks regard the drafting of a treaty between the USSR and the United States on 50% cuts in strategic offensive arms with the simultaneous observance by the sides of the ABM Treaty as a particularly important stage in nuclear disarmament.

It was also noted that any attempts on whatever pretext to escalate the arms race in other spheres would be at variance with the aims of radical cuts in nuclear weapons.

It cannot go unnoticed that in the capital of the FRG, which is generally considered to be the main military ally of the United States, moods favoring a renunciation of the nuclear arms race are now making themselves felt. The newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote last week in an article under the headline "Arms and Allies: Squabbles as a Result of Cuts in the NATO Nuclear Arsenal": "A major cataclysm has occurred in West Germany in Chancellor Helmut Kohl right-of-center Christian Democratic Party, which has dropped many of its former doubts and reservations as regards nuclear weapons cuts."

The FRG Government, THE NEW YORK TIMES went on, is leaning toward nondeployment of tactical nuclear weapons on its territory while U.S. General J. Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, is demanding that the FRG should agree to accept a new

missile with a range of approximately 280 miles as part of its arsenal, which would signify a substantial increase on the Lance missile's 60-mile range.

The governments of a number of other NATO countries, specifically Spain and Greece, also deem it necessary to make the most of the favorable atmosphere in order to end the dangerous arms race.

The leaders of Britain, and especially France, who oppose further progress toward a nuclear-free Europe, occupy diametrically opposite positions. Despite the fact that they support the decision of the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, they insist at the same time on the preservation and even buildup of other U.S., British, and French nuclear arms in NATO's possession.

The talks held at the end of the week between President F. Mitterrand of France, French Premier J. Chirac, and British Prime Minister M. Thatcher were largely devoted to questions of a further arms buildup and cooperation in the military sphere. Speaking at a press conference after the meeting, M. Thatcher declared that this cooperation "is to take place within the framework of NATO and enhance the block's effectiveness."

Meanwhile FRG Defense Minister Woerner, who is currently being groomed for the post of NATO secretary general, occupies a position on these questions that is closer to the viewpoints of the British and French Governments than to those expressed by certain colleagues in his own government. As recently as last Tuesday, speaking to journalists he confirmed his commitment to the strategy of "nuclear deterrence" and opposed the elimination of missiles with a range of 500 km and under.

Whatever the case, one thing is obvious: The new situation that has developed as a result of the conclusion of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has clearly shown that the NATO concept of peace built on "nuclear deterrence" has gone out of fashion. Real opportunities have emerged for building a nuclear-free European edifice which could become a stronghold of peace and good-neighborliness, despite the fact that its inhabitants would continue to live under different social systems.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are in favor of this. The future will tell what choice our West European partners will make.

Hands Off Nicaragua [subhead]

Again, for the umpteenth time, events taking place around Nicaragua have caused concern to people during the past week. At a time when the country is implementing far-reaching measures aimed at national reconciliation in accordance with the Guatemala agreement that was elaborated in August of last year, the U.S. President

has submitted a request to Congress for funds to aid the contras, who are rejecting reconciliation. Addressing reserve officers, he declared dramatically that allegedly there is a "possibility of a communist takeover (!) in Central America" and said that peace in that region depends... on U.S. aid to the contra gangs.

I have kept in my files a series of articles by Marcel Niedergang, special correspondent of the Paris newspaper *LE MONDE*, entitled "Nicaragua Under Siege," published back in July 1983.

He wrote: "Nicaragua is waging a life and death struggle for survival. With Washington's consent and support, its enemies are seeking to overthrow the Sandinista regime. How long will the Nicaraguan David be able to resist the pressure of the U.S. Goliath?"

Four and 1/2 years have passed, and the Washington Goliath has still not managed to bring this small Central American republic to its knees, despite the fact that Washington has spent more than \$1 billion since 1981 on the undeclared war against this country.

The war has brought the Nicaraguan people unheard of trials and tribulations. It has claimed more than 50,000 civilian victims. Direct material damage inflicted on the country by the war has reached \$376.7 million. The country is in ruins. But its people are continuing their courageous struggle demanding only one thing—to be left in peace. The Nicaraguan Government has stated for everyone to hear that if the intervention from outside ends, it will be able to ensure peace and tranquillity in its country on the basis of national reconciliation. The state of emergency has already been lifted in the country. A sweeping amnesty is being implemented. Opposition parties have been given permission to run 22 radio stations and publications. The government has opened direct talks with the contras on a cease-fire.

And what has happened? Declaring all these measures insufficient, the U.S. Administration demonstratively continues to supply weapons to the contras, encouraging them to continue military operations! A great deal has been written and said about this in the United States during the past week, in connection with reports that the Sandinistas downed a transport aircraft last Saturday which was carrying arms and munitions for the contras.

As J. Wright, speaker of the House of Representatives, correctly noted, "the people who are responsible for the formulation of the administration's policy do not really want a peaceful solution. They are seeking a military solution; they want to topple the Nicaraguan Government by force of arms."

Next week, on 3 and 4 February, the Congress will have to adopt a decision on the President's request for funds to aid the contras. It will be a serious test of the civic responsibility of congressmen and senators, especially

since the overwhelming majority of the electorate (72% according to public opinion polls) demand an end to interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs.

In the meantime President D. Ortega of Nicaragua has paid a working visit to Spain and Italy. He met with the heads of government of these countries and also with the pope in Rome. During these meetings problems connected with a peaceful settlement were discussed. Prime Minister F. Gonzalez of Spain declared that his country had accepted in principle Nicaragua's proposal that it take part in supervising the observance of peace agreements on condition that a cease-fire is reached in the region.

"Hands off Nicaragua!"—this cry is ringing out more and more loudly everywhere now. The Soviet public, just like the progressive public in all countries, demands that the generally recognized principle of international relations, the principle of noninterference in the affairs of other states, be strictly observed by all.

This is demanded by the new thinking, which rules out the use of violence in order to impose regimes that suit people who think they have a right to punish or pardon others.

This is demanded by human conscience, which calls for the establishment of civilized relations between states.

This is demanded by the common concern of all people for the survival of mankind.

East-West Roundtable Held on European Security
OW020527 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 2255 GMT 28 Jan 88

[A. Shashkov video report; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A roundtable on the topic "Europe—From the Atlantic to the Urals" has been held at the NOVOSTI press agency. Leading Soviet political scientists and their colleagues from Poland, Britain, France, Italy, and the FRG participated. [Video shows conferees at a long table with NOVOSTI Board Chairman Falin and unidentified man at its head] The discussion immediately took on an extremely significant nature. It turned out that the scientists from our country and Poland found themselves on one side of the table, while the West European political scientists found themselves on the other. Someone joked that even here a bloc mentality was in evidence.

The remark was not unfounded. Two fundamental views were being defended at the meeting: the Soviet proposal on the creation of a nuclear-free world—and subsequently a nuclear-free Europe—and the concept of nuclear deterrence, which was outlined, for example, by Pierre Lehouche.

[Video shows a man identified by caption as P. Lelouche, deputy director of the International Relations Institute (France), speaking to Shashkov, who translates his remarks] From my point of view, liquidation of all nuclear arms in Europe is, unfortunately, a utopia. The only thing that can be done is to preserve nuclear and conventional arms, but at the lowest possible level. This will permit achievement of parity in forces which would lead to more balanced political relations, and this is in everyone's interest.

As the Soviet roundtable participants noted, this attitude, whereby a state strives to preserve nuclear arms while other countries do not have them, contradicts a principle embodied in the UN Charter: All nations and states are equal. [Video cuts to show Shashkov talking to V.M. Falin]

[Begin recording] [Shashkov] Valentin Mikhaylovich, what is this roundtable's main purpose? As I understand it, the concepts of our West European colleagues and of Soviet political scientists have been common knowledge to both sides for quite some time now.

[Falin] You know, until now there has been quite a lack of understanding among foreign—West European and U.S.—scientists, political scientists, and journalists, about the meaning placed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the concepts of a common European house and a single Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Attitudes are predominantly traditional. They are attitudes governed by previous confrontational views and concepts which naturally either do not permit them to understand the new quality of international relations—particularly after the Washington signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—and attempts to ensure security in the world and in Europe at a lower military level.

In any event, it seems to me that such informal and unofficial gatherings give an objective opportunity to overcome some of these misperceptions. Europe is an integral thing. There can be only be one common security in Europe. [end recording]

UN Issues Report on Security of Missions
LD030904 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 3 (TASS)—By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev:

The United Nations committee on relations with the host country has urged the United States to adopt all essential measures to prevent any criminal actions violating the security of the UN missions and their staffs and the sanctity of their property.

The call was made in a report issued Tuesday at the UN headquarters. It stressed that protection for the UN missions and the security of their personnel were an indispensable condition for their effective work.

Regrettably, U.S. authorities have not been ensuring these conditions for foreign diplomats accredited at the United Nations. The report is literally strewn with examples of U.S. breaches of the host country agreement with the United Nations.

The missions of socialist nations and other countries not to the liking of Washington or reactionary American groups have been targeted for provocative and discriminatory activities.

As to the mission of the permanent observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, the U.S. authorities and the powerful Zionist lobby have been out to force it to leave the United States altogether.

The report pointed also to the unfavorable and hostile situation persisting with regard to the permanent UN mission of the USSR and its staff as well as to the Soviet personnel of the UN Secretariat and their family members.

The committee said in this connection that the authorities of the host country must take all the necessary measures to ensure a normal situation around the mission and the security of the Soviet nationals.

Diplomats from Costa Rica, Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan and many other countries lately have encountered discrimination in their search for housing, restrictions as far as the issuance of entry visas is concerned, and other artificial difficulties.

It is pointed out in UN circles that the report of the host country relations committee reflects the international community's justified concern about U.S. unwillingness to honor its agreement-based commitments in full and ensure normal conditions for effective work by the United Nations.

Delegate Previews UN Rights Commission Session
PM021135 Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 Jan 88 p 3

[Interview with V. Lomeyko, USSR Foreign Ministry ambassador-at-large, by correspondent I. Belov: "For a Constructive Dialogue"; place, date not given]

[Text] The latest (44th) session of the UN Commission on Human Rights opens in Geneva 1 February. It will spend 6 weeks discussing a wide range of humanitarian questions. In conversation with TRUD correspondent I. Belov, V. Lomeyko, USSR Foreign Ministry ambassador-at-large, who heads the Soviet delegation, shared his thoughts on the upcoming work and special features of this session.

Problems of human rights, of freedom and democracy, and of the relationship between the citizen and society are the object of an acute ideological struggle being waged in the modern world. Increasingly broad sections of working people in various countries are joining in the struggle for their political, social, and national interests, and their readiness to win and defend their rights is growing. At the same time, the working people's class enemy is seeking to preserve and strengthen the principles of bourgeois individualism and social and economic inequality, frequently passing these principles off as the "eternal norms" of human relationships.

The Human Rights Commission is one of the basic organs of the UN system. It is meant to tackle questions of international cooperation with a view to encouraging and developing respect for human rights on the basis of strict observance of the principles of the UN Charter. The commission is made up of 43 states, including the USSR, the Belorussian SSR, Bulgaria, and the GDR. Observers from many other countries and representatives of intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations also participate actively in the sessions' work.

At this session the commission will discuss in detail questions such as human rights violations in southern Africa, in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, and in Chile. The commission will also talk about problems of the struggle against racism, racial discrimination, apartheid, Nazi and neofascist ideology, and the practice of hiring mercenaries. The session's extensive agenda includes questions of the implementation of an entire package of economic, social, cultural, and also civil and political rights in the world and the strengthening of the treaty basis of cooperation on human rights—international pacts, above all.

As is known, the 40th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will be celebrated at the end of this year. Therefore, the commission will discuss measures devoted to that date. Special attention will also be devoted to questions such as the influence of scientific and technical progress on human rights, the ensuring of the rights of children and migrant workers, and the elimination of religious intolerance. In short, the agenda is very full and embraces a wide range of issues of concern to people in all countries.

At the session the Soviet Union will put forward a program of constructive international cooperation in the humanitarian sphere and will make efforts to enshrine positive elements and the spirit of mutual understanding and productive dialogue in the commission's work and decisions. The USSR's new approaches to this sphere, formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress, are finding more and more supporters in the world community. This was manifested at the UN General Assembly, in particular. We will advocate ridding the humanitarian sphere of political and ideological confrontation, stereotypes of the past, and pressure from the "image of the enemy." The debate must be founded on values common to all

mankind and on people's real strivings and aspirations. We will emphasize the need to ensure the paramount right of all peoples and every person—the right to live under conditions of peace and freedom.

We will have something to say to our colleagues at this session. The first results of restructuring, the new legislative acts, the broadening of glasnost, the further strengthening and broadening of the Soviet person's rights and freedoms—these are to our credit. But this process is continuing, and we have not yet managed to overcome all the difficulties. Therefore, we will emphasize that the Soviet Union's course is immutable and dictated by the internal requirements of the socialist society's development. It is in this constructive spirit that we are preparing our proposals and draft resolutions.

We hope the majority of the commission member countries will support our proposals and our line. But we will be realists. It is no easy matter to abandon the spirit of confrontation in a single day, and the West has traditionally used human rights issues for anti-Soviet, antisocialist purposes. We expect such sallies primarily from the U.S. delegation at this session. The United States proposes to raise the question of human rights "violations" in Cuba. Last year, as is known, it failed to push through such a resolution. We know that the Americans are already intensively indoctrinating representatives of a number of developing states in the direction they require. In addition, they have taken the unprecedented step of appointing Valladares, a Cuban emigre, as head of the U.S. delegation.

The Western delegates will, as before, continue the ballyhoo over Afghanistan. They do not care about the actual processes in that country. But the positive changes in Afghanistan have been reflected to some extent in a report by F. Ermakora [name as published], specialist reporter for the Human Rights Commission, who can hardly be suspected of having pro-Soviet convictions. We will advocate that the decisions adopted by the commission should objectively reflect the processes taking place in that country.

Sallies against Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland cannot be ruled out, and the Cambodian question will be blown up once again. Direct anti-Soviet actions are also very likely. As previously, our opponents could raise questions on the Baltic republics, the Crimean Tatars, and "discrimination" against persons of Jewish or German nationality and believers. We also have something to say on these questions.

In conclusion, I will point out that at the Geneva session we also intend to remind people that more than a year ago our country submitted an official proposal to convene in Moscow a representative conference of the All-European Conference participant states on the entire

package of humanitarian problems, including the problem of human rights. As is known, certain Western countries are still trying to evade giving a clear-cut reply to that specific proposal. But we await precisely a clear reply.

ICFTU Delegate on View of Reagan, Gorbachev

PM021241 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 88
Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Article in AFTONBLADET"]

[Text] Stockholm, 25 Jan—The newspaper AFTONBLADET has carried an article by its Washington correspondent Bert Villborg entitled "Reagan Does Not Know How Matters Stand," based on an interview with Stig Malm, chairman of the Swedish Trade Union Confederation, in connection with his trip to the United States as part of a delegation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). The article is subtitled "Malm Disappointed After White House Visit."

S. Malm, the article says, was troubled after the White House visit. "Ronald Reagan began reading a prepared paper, and when we said that we hoped we would receive answers to our questions an aide appeared and prevented this."

S. Malm was part of the ICFTU delegation that had earlier met with Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev and now had the opportunity to meet with the American President to present their message on problems of peace.

"That discussion was of a different nature. We had the opportunity to talk with Reagan for half an hour, but the open discussion that we had hoped for did not take place," Malm said.

"The meeting with M.S. Gorbachev lasted 2 and 1/2 hours. It is quite obvious that a completely different impression is created by a person with whom you have the chance to hold a dialogue for a long time. M.S. Gorbachev seemed charming, intelligent, energetic, and courageous."

"But what about Reagan, then?" the writer of the article asked. "He appears not to know how matters stand. In my opinion, what we saw was acting."

"We cannot complain about the level and rank of those whom we met. However, M.S. Gorbachev showed a greater grasp than half the Reagan administration staff," said Stig Malm. "There were many repetitions during our conversation in Washington, but what disturbed me particularly forcefully was the fact that all the people we met gave utterly stereotyped answers."

One thing particularly bothered S. Malm: "Reagan devoted more than one-fourth of his time to negative statements about the Soviet Union, while M.S. Gorbachev gave only 2 minutes to expounding his standpoint on American policy. It would have been better if Reagan had also preferred to talk constructively about his own policy."

The American President, the article goes on to say, did not impress the Swedish Trade Union Confederation chairman so much as Reagan had impressed Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson after his visit to the White House last year. But, after all, the Swedish Trade Union Confederation chairman is freer in what he says than a head of government during an official visit. Whatever Reagan spoke about was couched in the language of strength and, in particular, the need to arm before disarming, he said.

United States & Canada

Defense Ministry Confirms Yazov-Carlucci Meeting *LD031222 Moscow World Service in English* *1200 GMT 3 Feb 88*

(Text) The Soviet Ministry of Defense has confirmed the agreement on a meeting between the Soviet defense minister, General Dmitriy Yazov, and the United States defense secretary, Frank Carlucci. The meeting is to take place in Bern, Switzerland, next month.

Campaign To 'Brainwash' Congress on Contra Aid *LD022100 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT* *2 Feb 88*

[Text] Washington February 2 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

On the last day to go before the voting in the House of Representatives on February 3 on the request of the White House for new aid to contras, the administration sharply stepped up the campaign to brainwash congressmen. Legislators who have not yet assumed a definite stand were invited for another meeting with President Reagan in the White House, while U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz was sent to the Capitol Hill.

Speaking today in the House Committee for Foreign Affairs Shultz asserted again that it is only the appropriation of more funds for the undeclared war against Nicaragua that will give a chance to peace in Central America.

Opposition in Congress Noted

LD030941 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev:

President Reagan issued a special television address to the nation from the Oval Office on Tuesday. It was some kind of a final touch in the intensive lobbying campaign launched by the White House in recent weeks in an attempt to make the law-makers approve the new request for aid to the Nicaraguan contras.

Yet President Reagan did not say anything new, as a matter of fact, and the whole of his statement reduced to a repetition of the administration's hackneyed arguments about some "communist threat" in Central America and the need to carry on military pressure on Nicaragua. The address, which was broadly advertised by the White House, was evaluated by many local observers as a desperate attempt at pushing through the Congress the request for new funds for continuing the undeclared war against Nicaragua with the hands of the contras.

Yet the U.S. Administration was in for an unpleasant surprise: All the three biggest U.S. commercial television companies—ABC, NBC and CBS—refused to break off their regular programs for telecasting President Reagan's address, which caused open exasperation in the White House. Explaining the reason behind the unprecedented refusal of the three biggest U.S. television companies to telecast Reagan's address to the nation from the Oval Office, the head of the Washington bureau of the CBS television company noted that the President's views on that issue were well-known.

Presenting the Democratic Party's response to the address by the U.S. chief executive, Lee Hamilton, an influential congressman, emphasized that the request of the White House for new funds for the contras should be rejected. He also pointed out that the "President's request will cripple, if not destroy the peace process" in Central America. "It will lead toward more war," the congressman stressed.

A few hours before President Reagan's address, James Wright, the speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, declared his confidence that the administration's request would be rejected on February 3 by a majority of congressmen both from the Democratic and the Republican Party. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which examined the request of the White House on Tuesday, also recommended the full session of the Senate, where voting is scheduled for February 4, to turn down the request. Ten Democrat senators unanimously declared in favour of that decision, and representatives of the Republican Party pointedly refused to participate in the committee meeting. As Senator Claiborne Pell, the chairman of the committee, said, the granting of additional military aid to the contras would be a most ill-considered step which can undermine the process of a peaceful settlement in Central America.

Yet broad opposition on the Capitol Hill to continuing military aid to the contras does not mean at all that the American law-makers have decided to leave to the mercy of fate the gangs of mercenaries trained and guided by the CIA. Representatives of the leadership of both parties have already started discussing an alternative plan that would provide for the appropriation for the contras only of "humanitarian aid", so that it could be sent for examination by the House of Representatives late in February.

U.S. Peace Plan 'Legalizes' Israeli Occupation *LD022145 Moscow TASS in English 1822 GMT* *2 Feb 88*

[Text] Damascus February 2 TASS—The newspaper NEW YORK POST has reported that the United States is busy devising a new plan for the Middle East. This "peace plan" advanced by the Reagan administration presupposes the resumption of talks between the Israelis and Palestinians on the so-called administrative autonomy for the population of the captured Arab lands.

In developing this idea, Washington maintained close contacts with Tel Aviv. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir said in this connection that his country was ready to take part in peace negotiations on the U.S. terms and made clear that at issue was temporary settlement whose formula somewhat differed from the one which the United States and Israel worked out several years ago.

So, what is the difference between the notorious new formula from the Camp-David deal proposed by Washington and Tel Aviv some time ago? All of its "novelty" is in trimming the period of imposing the notorious limited autonomy on the Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied Arab lands.

The project of the truncated autonomy, which actually legalizes the Israeli occupation of the ancestral Arab lands and ignores the Palestinians' inalienable rights, has long since been unanimously rejected by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), the sole lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine, the majority of the Arab countries, and broad circles of the world progressive public. But the Israeli premier is in a hurry to approve the White House new attempt to convert the cause of the Middle East settlement into the channel of separate deals. He stated that he gave preference to this idea rather than an international conference which he did not embrace whatsoever.

It is noteworthy that Washington forged ahead with the "new plan" of the Middle East settlement, which is actually a renovated variant of the old Camp-David accords, right at the time when Tel Aviv launched harsh reprisals without precedent against the Palestinians who staged an uprising. The White House is out to give urgent help to its strategic ally which got into a crisis situation, divert the attention of the world public from the crack down on the peaceful population of the occupied Arab lands.

Simultaneously, the United States makes open attempts to prevent a genuine solution to the the Middle East problem with due account for the interests of all parties concerned. For instance, the United States voted against the adoption by the U.N. Security Council of the resolution tabled by non-aligned countries, which underscored an urgent need to achieve under the auspices of this organisation a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, of which the Palestinian problem is an integral part.

The conclusion prompts itself that the United States in fact is not interested at all in a genuine peace settlement in the Middle East, in holding an international peace settlement in the Middle East, in holding an international peace conference but is bent on pushing the matter towards imposing new separate deals on Arab nations.

Vasilyev Analyzes U.S Role in UN Mideast Talks
LD021341 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 (TASS)—TASS analyst Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The United States vetoed a draft resolution of the U.N. Security Council proposed by non-aligned countries. The document points to the dire need for reaching (under the U.N. aegis) an all-embracing, just and stable settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict whose component part is the Palestinian problem. It also contains a demand to Israel to stop immediately the policy and practices on the occupied Arab territories, which are a crude violation of human rights.

The pro-Israeli and anti-Arab character of Washington's Middle East policy has manifested itself again. The stand taken by the United States in the Security Council demonstrated again the worth of harangues by U.S. officials about a "balanced" approach of the White House to Middle Eastern affairs. Illusions which had been entertained by some Arab quarters concerning Washington's "mediation role" in a Middle Eastern settlement and its positive contribution to the cause of peace in the explosive area, vanished into thin air. It is not by chance that even the most "moderate" Arab leaders revealed disenchantment in their speeches at the U.S. position.

It is indicative that the United States took the negative stand in the Security Council at a time when Tel Aviv is quashing with an iron fist the uprising of Palestinians on the occupied territories and when the project of "autonomy" for the Palestinian population of the Jordan West Bank and the Gaza Strip was again brought to light. The USA continues denying the Palestinian Arabs the inalienable right to national self-determination. In fact, it is not interested in the earliest and just solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

It is highly improbable that the coming presidential elections in the United States to be held this year will make any change in this position, since the pro-Israeli Zionist lobby plays an important role in them.

U.S. Presidential Election Campaign Viewed
PM021619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Viktor Linnik dispatch under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Leap Year"]

[Excerpts] New York—America has entered a presidential election year and, thus, a year with an increased level of political ballyhoo, uproar, and bustle, a time of sensations and scandals, of takeoff for some and downfall for others. The Democratic and Republican party caucuses will begin in Iowa in a few days' time, during

which the first delegates to the parties' national conventions will be elected. At present R. Dole is leading for the Republicans and G. Hart for the Democrats in polls conducted among that state's voters.

The chief attention is now focused on Iowa and New Hampshire, where the first primaries of 1988 will later be held, although the percentage of convention delegates elected in these states is very insignificant, for the states are small [sentence as published]. However, the special hullabaloo the U.S. mass media always stir up over these states as the first in a presidential year affects the candidates' popularity in other places in the country: Newspapers start writing about the winners, they are shown more frequently on television, and the flow of money into their election funds increases sharply.

At present the largest such funds are in the possession of Vice President G. Bush for the Republicans and Massachusetts Governor M. Dukakis for the Democrats. Money is the blood in the arteries of U.S. election campaigns. But in principle, the fattest purse still does not mean the largest number of supporters. The dependence here is far from being so straightforward.

You can take different views of U.S. elections. You can expose their hypocrisy, falsity, and venality with the devoutness of true believers. You can laugh at them as political slapstick and an endless circus show. You can ignore them altogether, as almost half the nonvoting adult U.S. population does. Each assessment is fair in its own way, each one has the right to exist.

But, at the same time, it is impossible not to acknowledge one obvious truth: All of U.S. political life essentially revolves around the elections. Whether we like it or not, whether we want to look at this condescendingly or are simply at a loss over it, it is a fact that cannot be disregarded. [passage omitted]

Far from everything in U.S. elections is a farce; not everything is tomfoolery. Of course, as a result of the elections power remains, just the same, in the hands of the ruling class as a whole. But, at the same time, people (both Americans and the surrounding world) are far from indifferent to the tactical paths proposed by a particular bourgeois party for pursuing the class line.

No one in the course of elections essentially has the right to propose a radical alternative to U.S. capitalism without risking political suicide—the iron tyranny of the two-party U.S. system is consistently manifested in this. "Third" parties, including the Communist Party of the United States, are subjected to regular political ostracism.

But the task of strengthening capitalism—and this, in the final analysis, is precisely what both bourgeois parties are engaged in—not only does not rule out but directly

presupposes a clash of different viewpoints during elections within the framework of a unified class approach and, accordingly, a search for optimum solutions. Elections do the ruling class a good service.

Finally, the U.S. election campaign fulfills one function of tremendous importance: It creates the illusion of involving the masses in top political decisions. In fact, the country's top official is put forward during the two-stage elections, in which everyone can participate.

It is true that almost half the Americans are not subject to this illusion: They simply do not vote. But, first, this suits the ruling class perfectly, since the least educated and, accordingly, the poorest section of U.S. society, does not participate in elections. Second, this generally is a feature of America in recent decades, for the level of political culture on the whole is undoubtedly lower here than in other Western countries.

In any event, for some this is just a leap year. For the United States, it is always a presidential election year. Taking into account the complex and extensive agenda of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue this year, one can be certain that questions of Soviet-U.S. relations will occupy a very important place among the foreign policy themes of the election campaign.

U.S. 'Hypocrisy' on Human Rights Issues Hit
PM021611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 88
Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Vitaliy Korionov under rubric "Viewpoint": "The Source of Their Fear"]

[Text] There is simply no limit to the readiness with which American political figures discuss the state of human rights and freedoms, not in the United States, of course, but in other countries—particularly in the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

In the last few days, however, a considerable number of articles and commentaries have appeared in the United States which deal with this subject from a strictly American standpoint. The reason for this is that it is the anniversary of the day in 1865 when U.S. President A. Lincoln signed a congressional resolution on introducing the 13th Amendment to the American Constitution on the abolition of slavery. February 1 is consequently celebrated in the United States as National Freedom Day.

Exactly what kind of freedom, what kind of human rights does Washington now want?

In my opinion, it would be useful in this respect to acquaint the reader with a voluminous report recently published in the United States, entitled "Reagan Administration Policy in the Human Rights Sphere in 1987." It has been compiled by two U.S. social organizations: "Human Rights Watch" and the "Lawyers Committee for Human Rights."

The Reagan administration's policy in the human rights sphere is primarily oriented toward promoting U.S. geopolitical interests, and military regimes unquestioningly subordinate to Washington's diktat are the main instruments used to attain these goals—this is the main conclusion reached by the document.

Yes, the practices of the U.S. ruling circles in recent decades are most convincing evidence that their interpretation of human rights is highly original. Fundamental human rights, such as the right to life, to work, to freedom from racial or national oppression, and to social and political equality, and various others are in fact rejected and substituted by just one: the right to free emigration for any citizen. The socialist countries also share this principle, promoting its implementation in line with the laws of the state concerned, of course. But they persistently work to ensure that every member of society can fully exercise all human rights in practice, and especially the most fundamental of them.

The exercise of these rights is the concern of the whole state. It cannot be left entirely in the hands of a small, "select" group of people who arbitrarily decide precisely which members of society enjoy which rights and which members do not. But this is how it is done in countries where, through Washington's will, the decision of these matters is completely in the control of reactionary cliques. It is no accident that Haiti, El Salvador, and other such regimes are often held up as "model examples" of human rights fulfillment across the ocean. "Claims that democracy has finally triumphed, or is at least beginning to be established in all these countries, are at best untrue, as the military is still the dominant force in these states, while human rights violations continue and civil law and order are absent," says the report by "Human Rights Watch" and the "Lawyers Committee."

The hypocrisy of Washington politicians knows no bounds. U.S. aid for the militia and the military in El Salvador or Haiti is justified by the fact that this aid will supposedly "make it possible to reinforce the professional training of these forces and thereby ultimately contribute to their stopping human rights violations." Surely this is tantamount to arming a band of criminals and instructing them to bring order to a city?

As the aforementioned report points out, "there is no evidence to suggest that the administration ever made economic or military aid for countries such as South Korea, Pakistan, or Turkey—all strategically important

to U.S. interests—conditional upon their observance of human rights or that it even threatened to cut off this aid on account of their violating these rights."

It would be naive to expect such a step from Washington which, itself shamelessly trampling on many elementary human rights in the United States, regards these military regimes as a reliable means by which to suppress human rights in other countries. It has even reached the stage where the financing and training of the contras in Nicaragua or the UNITA rebels in Angola, who are struggling to violently overthrow governments lawfully elected by the people, is substantiated by claims that this "military intervention is part of the process of 'establishing democracy' and must be used as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the governments of these countries in order to force them to improve their human rights record."

It is becoming increasingly obvious why Washington "human rights champions" are assiduously ignoring the Soviet Union's proposal to hold a broad international forum in Moscow to discuss the entire complex of humanitarian issues. These gentlemen are afraid that their unseemly acts will be exposed to the whole world in the cold light of day!

Higher Education Cooperation Accord Signed
LD281534 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0730 GMT 28 Jan 88

[Text] Washington, 28 January—TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy reports:

The visit to the United States of a delegation of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education from 9 to 26 January, as guests of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, has ended.

The delegation visited universities in the states of New York, North Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana. Its visit has laid the foundations for cooperation between the two countries' higher educational establishments. During the visit, a major accord was concluded on exchanges of students between the two countries' higher educational establishments. A memorandum on the accord was signed in Washington by E.V. Linde, Latvian SSR Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, and Allan Ostar, executive director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

The exchanges envisaged in the memorandum will begin in September of this year. Additional consultations will be held to finalize details.

In April of this year, a delegation of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities will carry out a return visit to the USSR. The memorandum notes: "Like the trip of the Soviet delegation to the United States, the April visit will pursue several aims." Among

them are: meetings with representatives of the Soviet higher education system; visits to higher educational establishments; consideration of possibilities for joint research; technical cooperation and exchanges of materials; and the study of prospects for exchanges of teachers.

Bob Arsenault, a representative of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, stressed in an interview with a TASS correspondent: "The aim of the planned exchanges is two-fold. Since we are talking about students and teachers, the first aim is to learn and teach. The second one is to improve mutual understanding between the peoples of our countries."

AUCCTU Chief Receives U.S. Labor Union Group
PM281411 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Jan 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Conversation at AUCCTU"]

[Text] On 18 January S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, received a delegation from the American Federation of Government Employees headed by its secretary-treasurer A. Kaplan, which is paying a friendly visit to our country at the invitation of the State Institution Workers Union Central Committee.

At the delegation members' request, S.A. Shalayev described the course of restructuring and the trade unions' role in implementing it and their participation in the struggle for nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of peace.

For their part, the guests gave their impressions of their stay in the Soviet Union. The delegation members stressed Soviet people's friendliness and hospitality. The delegation members noted with satisfaction that they have had an opportunity to acquaint themselves extensively with Soviet working people's living and working conditions and the activity of their trade unions, as well as meeting with workers and trade union activists to discuss questions of mutual interest with them. The guests expressed the hope that the delegation's visit to the Soviet Union has helped improve mutual understanding between working people and trade unions in the USSR and the United States in the interests of peace.

Taking part in the conversation were V.S. Kuzmichev, chairman of the State Institution Workers Union Central Committee, L.I. Novak, chairman of the Medical Workers Union Central Committee, and B.A. Averyanov, chief of the AUCCTU's International Department.

Soviet-U.S. Environmental Committee Meets
LD011650 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 1 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 1 TASS—The Soviet Union and the United States are working on more than 40 joint programmes and projects in the field of environmental protection, the chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Hydrometeorology said today.

Yuri Izrael is leading the Soviet delegation at the 11th meeting of the U.S.-USSR joint committee on cooperation in the field of environmental protection, which opened here Monday.

The U.S. delegation is led by Lee W. Thomas, administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The joint committee was set up under the 1972 Soviet-U.S. agreement on cooperation in environmental protection. The sides' cooperation covers eleven problems, including the study of the global climate and the state of the earth's ozone layer.

The current meeting will discuss the results of the committee's activities and map out a programme for cooperation in 1988.

Murakhovskiy Receives Thomas
LD021859 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—Vsevolod Murakhovsky, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Agro-Industrial Committee, received today Lee Thomas, head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administration, now in the USSR in conjunction with the holding of the 11th session of the mixed Soviet-U.S. Commission on Cooperation in the field of environmental protection.

The sides discussed the state of bilateral ties under the intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in the field of environmental protection and also considered some measures to translate into action the initiatives launched during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in December, 1987. They underscored the importance of pooling the two countries' efforts in dealing with several global problems of mutual interest.

Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, took part in the talk.

Book Written by Tolkunov Reviewed

PM011455 [Editorial report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 January 1988 in its Second Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Sycamores and Birches" a 400-word review under the "Books" rubric by V. Ovchinnikov. The author reviews the book "The Sycamores Are Still Young" ["Sikamory Yeshche Molody..."] by the late Andrey Tolkunov, PRAVDA's New York correspondent, who died from a serious (unspecified) illness at the age of 37. Ovchinnikov notes that the theme of Tolkunov's book is America and the Americans in the eighties, beginning with the "crusade" against the "evil empire" and ending with the "first joint steps by the USSR and the United States toward a nuclear-free world." The title of the review refers to the closing lines

of Tolkunov's book and are "dedicated to the birch trees of Sheremetyevo, which, "like the sycamores of Princeton, symbolize the native roots so necessary to every man."

Comparison of Gromyko Receiving U.S. Businessman

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 28 January carries in its Second Edition on page 4 a TASS report on Gromyko's meeting with U.S. businessman George Soros. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Talk in the Kremlin," has been compared with the TASS English version published in the 28 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 25-26, revealing the following variations:

page 25:

column two, line one reads in PRAVDA: Business and cultural ties should play an important part in Soviet-U.S. relations following the visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles between the two countries.

George Soros is a leading American financier. He controls an international investment fund capitalized at around \$2 billion—this fund is recognized in U.S. business circles as the world's most successful. The New York businessman has now come to Moscow in connection with the activities of the "Soros Foundation."

A.A. Gromyko received the American guest in the Kremlin on 27 January. On the occasion of the session in Moscow of the joint committee of the Soviet Cultural Foundation and the "Soros Foundation," the American businessman was accompanied by... (rewording, picking up paragraph two, sentence two)

column one, paragraph seven, line eight reads in PRAVDA: At present such ties between the USSR and the United States are living through a period of stagnation and this situation, of course, is abnormal. [new paragraph] The political line... (omitting "I must say with regret that" and "Andrey Gromyko said")

page 26:

column one, paragraph one, line two reads in PRAVDA: ... economic and trade relations. Under its influence... (omitting "Andrey Gromyko went on")

same paragraph, line seven reads in PRAVDA: ...possibilities to develop it. [new paragraph] The hope was... (omitting "he said")

column one, paragraph two, line four reads in PRAVDA: ...ties with the United States. (substituting "United States" for "Soviet Union")

column one, paragraph seven, line one reads in PRAVDA: ...ties between our countries. This will probably... (omitting "Andrey Gromyko went on")

China

Zhao Ziyang, Cambodia's Sihanouk Hold Talks

OW021349 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia
1200 GMT 2 Feb 88

[Text] Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, met with Prince Sihanouk yesterday in Beijing. [words indistinct] As everyone knows, Sihanouk announced last Saturday that he would no longer serve as the so-called president of Democratic Kampuchea. He also refused to continue talks with Hun Sen, though the third round of such talks was originally scheduled to be held in April.

Observers have pointed out that with Sihanouk's voluntary resignation, differences are bound to appear among the leaders of the tripartite Khmer coalition government.

PRC Trade Delegation Arrives in Soviet Far East

LD311802 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT
31 Jan 88

[Text] Nakhodka January 31 TASS—A foreign trade delegation of the Chinese province of Jilin arrived in the Soviet far eastern city of Nakhodka today. The delegation is led by General Director of the main export-import foreign trade company of the province, Yang Funchun.

The Chinese side will have seven-day negotiations at the foreign trade association "Dalintorg" on questions of further development of the border trade between the province of Jilin and a number of areas and districts of the Soviet far east and Siberia.

The border trade between the USSR and the People's Republic of China now involves the maritime territory, the Khabarovsk area, the Amur, Chita and other districts located on a huge territory from the Urals to the Soviet Union's Pacific coast. The Chinese side is represented by the provinces of Heilongjiang, Jilin, the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region and also the city of Harbin.

The partners living on both sides of the Soviet-Chinese frontier are showing considerable interest in trade exchange, in expansion of its pattern. The Soviet side supplies the People's Republic of China through the "Dalintorg" with mineral fertilizers, merchantable wood, building materials, consumer goods, marine products. Chinese provinces export various farm produce and light industry products to areas of Siberia and the far east.

"We believe that the Soviet-Chinese border trade which reached 50 million roubles in 1987 is just at the initial stage", said Vitaliy Mizinchikov, director of the specialised "Dalprigran" firm of the "Dalintorg" association. "We and our colleagues from the People's Republic of China are confident that this form of trade is a good supplement to the inter-state trade, and has good prospects".

The Province of Jilin is becoming actively involved in the border trade.

At the negotiations both sides are to elaborate a number of new trade exchange agreements. The guests from the People's Republic of China will also familiarise themselves with enterprises of Nakhodka and cultural life of the city.

Xiang Cited on Obstacles to U.S., USSR Ties

OW301325 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT
22 Jan 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Recently observers of various countries, including the Soviet Union, have paid great attention to an article by Huan Xiang on Sino-U.S. relations published in the weekly LIAOWANG. This is entirely understandable. Huan Xiang is well-known as the director of the International Studies Center of the PRC State Council. His article is definitely of great importance in principle.

In this article, Huan Xiang makes an intensive and candid analysis of the present state of Sino-U.S. relations by citing a lot of reference materials. For instance, he points out directly that the past year has seen factors for instability appearing on the road of the development of Sino-U.S. relations. What, in Huan Xiang's opinion, are the negative factors affecting the relations between the two countries? In this regard, Huan Xiang points out six controversial issues that have appeared between China and the United States. These include the Taiwan question, which has existed for years, and all anti-China resolutions recently adopted by the U.S. Congress.

Huan Xiang analyzes these controversial issues in detail. He states that the six issues can be divided into two categories according to their nature. Included in one category are the issues grossly interfering in China's internal affairs. The other category covers those issues that are political blackmail against China. All this, he stresses, is a reflection of hegemonism and shows that the factors for the instability of Sino-U.S. relations have increased.

Huan Xiang fairly condemns these U.S. acts. He states that all this is not in the interest of improving relations between the two countries, nor will it add to the brilliance of the United States.

Huan Xiang touches on the question of how to develop Sino-U.S. relations in the contemporary world. In this connection, he expounds on four measures in principle: learn to respect each other, achieve mutual understanding, recognize the fact that both peoples have the right to choose their own state system and ideology, and value the achievements already made in relations between the two countries and do not harm or damage such achievements. Observers say that these proposals set forth by Huan Xiang cannot be disapproved, but it should be added that for the sake of the smooth development of relations between the two countries, both must have a desire for such development because, as the famous saying goes, it is impossible to clap with one hand.

We believe the four measures in principle for developing Sino-U.S. relations, stated Huan Xiang, are entirely applicable to the development of relations with other countries. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, our country's foreign policy consistently adheres to the principles of mutual esteem and understanding, equality, mutual benefit, no interference in each other's internal affairs, and respect for the sovereignty and national dignity of other countries. These principles constitute the basis of the policy that the Soviet Union is pursuing in dealing with other countries, including China.

In analyzing the relations among China, the United States, and the Soviet Union, Huan Xiang briefly outlines the current state of Soviet-Chinese relations. He acknowledges that certain developments have been made in the relations between China and the Soviet Union. In the meantime, however, he points out that because the three major obstacles have yet to be resolved, it will take considerable time to make a genuine improvement in Sino-Soviet relations. What shall we say about Huan Xiang's assessment?

Recently relations between the Soviet Union and China have improved remarkably. This has been pointed out with satisfaction by both countries. There can be no doubt about this fact. As for Huan Xiang's allegation that considerable time is required to eliminate the three major obstacles, frankly speaking, it provokes controversy and problems. First of all, are the three major obstacles in Sino-Soviet relations referred to by Huan Xiang gross interference in China's internal affairs or political blackmail against China as are the six controversial issues in Sino-U.S. relations? Second, two of the three major obstacles referred to by Huan Xiang—namely, the questions concerning Cambodia and Afghanistan—will be eliminated shortly by political means. Third, regarding the other major obstacle, the deployment of troops along the border of the two countries, the Soviet leadership has said on many occasions that this matter can be solved by negotiation.

To sum up, we have every reason to believe that Soviet-Chinese relations can make great headway within a short time. In this regard, it is necessary to review a remark made by Soviet leader Gorbachev in a recent interview

with the LIAOWANG weekly on developing relations between the two countries. He said: By moving to meet each other, it is possible to find mutually acceptable solutions—of this we are certain.

U.S. Listing of PRC as Hostile State Viewed

*OW011352 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0600 GMT 31 Jan 88*

["Short commentary" by station commentator Shakov]

[Text] Political figures in Washington were embarrassed by an unexpected disclosure that the U.S. authorities had listed China as a hostile country. This has raised doubts about all the friendly and sympathetic statements made by U.S. officials on the PRC in the past.

The fact that China was blacklisted by the U.S. authorities has left a deep impression on the public. This fact was kept strictly secret. Now the Washington authorities are looking for the one who divulged the secret. The fire is now concentrated on some Pentagon law workers who divulged the secret in a Washington district court, which tried a case brought by two American soldiers who had been deprived of their right to have any contact with secret documents. The reason given was that they were of Vietnamese origin. Did they firmly believe that Vietnam, like China, should be listed as a hostile country?

Because of a slip of the tongue, a representative of the U.S. military authorities openly made a statement to the contrary, thus causing a big argument.

However, there is nothing strange about this. American hostility to the socialist countries, including the PRC, has always been one of the cornerstones of U.S. foreign policy in Asia. Such hostility was displayed during the U.S. aggression against the Korean people and against Vietnam, and it was displayed when American bellicose elements were preparing to launch a nuclear attack on Chinese industrial centers. The United States had such an intention while waging an aggressive war.

It is not accidental that Washington supports its friends politically, economically, and militarily. Nor is it accidental that such a disclosure was made at the Washington district court. It was a result of the reality of U.S. foreign policy.

PRC Envoy to India on Border Issue, Trade

*OW021054 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT
1 Feb 88*

[Text] In his speech at a forum in New Delhi, PRC Ambassador to India Tu Guowei said: The Sino-Indian border issue should not become a barrier to more extensive development of bilateral relations.

The Chinese ambassador pointed out that the volume of trade between China and India remains rather low and is now about \$100 million. There are no direct flights between the two countries yet, and this is not conducive to the development of relations between the two countries.

Ambassador Tu Guowei expressed the belief that the border dispute between the two countries will certainly be settled.

Northeast Asia

DPRK Ends Contacts on Returning U.S. Remains

*LD021534 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT
2 Feb 88*

[Text] Pyongyang February 2 TASS—The secretary from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the military commission on a truce in Korea notified his U.S. counterpart today that the unofficial personal contacts on the return of the remains of American servicemen killed during the Korea War are terminated.

The U.S. side approached the DPRK representative with a request for such contacts on January 28.

The KOREA CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY (KCNA) in its report placed the whole blame for the discontinuation of the contacts on the American side.

The United States and South Korean authorities are continuing to make groundless charges against the DPRK in connection with the disappearance of a South Korean airliner.

Describing the DPRK as a "terrorist state", the U.S. Administration has announced a number of discriminatory sanctions undermining this country's sovereignty and constituting an insult to it.

The issue of resuming the contacts cannot be solved until the United States stops its subversive actions against the DPRK in connection with the disappearance of the South Korean airliner and lifts the unjust discriminatory sanctions, the KCNA said.

Businessman Views Soviet-Japanese Trade Talks

*LD292015 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT
29 Jan 88*

[Text] Tokyo January 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko reports:

The radical restructuring of the economic mechanism which is going on in the USSR creates objective conditions for a further development of trade between the Soviet Union and Japan, for the mastering of new forms of mutually advantageous economic relations. This idea

was expressed in most of the reports made at the 11th joint conference of the Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet committees on economic cooperation which is under way here.

Representatives of the two countries point out the positive experience of business relations accumulated, specifically, during the realization of general agreements on cooperation in various spheres of economy. The conference is discussing concrete problems, including those connected with the concluding of a general agreement on timber, as well as economic cooperation projects due to be realized in the 90s.

At the same time, it was pointed out at the conference that the experience of bilateral trade relations shows that the putting up on their way of artificial obstacles by some official circles in Tokyo results in their stagnation, which does not meet national interests of the two countries. It is cooperation free from discriminatory measures which is needed for a steady development of Soviet-Japanese economic relations.

Japanese trade and industrial circles come out for the activization of relations with Soviet partners and are ready to outline new spheres of business cooperation that go beyond the scope of ordinary commercial export-import operations, Iohai Mimura [name as received], president of Mitsubishi Shoji, Japan's biggest trade corporation, pointed out. The economic reform carried out in the USSR creates a good basis for it. There are a number of spheres with mutually advantageous prospects for both sides. In the opinion of the prominent Japanese businessman, those spheres include industrial cooperation, the development of production relations in the sphere of energy and material saving technologies, environmental protection and the launching of joint ventures.

During the discussion of ways to expand mutually advantageous economic relations between the USSR and Japan, it was pointed out that the combining of scientific and technological developments of Soviet scientists and the experience of Japanese firms in their introduction could be one of the promising spheres of cooperation.

Relations With Japan, Far East Tension Viewed
LD291917 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT
29 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 29 (TASS)—TASS Political News Analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

The Japanese Government has demonstrated at the session of Japanese parliament which resumed its work in Tokyo its ambivalent stand on questions connected with the consolidation of peace, international security and cooperation. Speaking at a plenary meeting of the upper chamber of parliament, Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita pointed out in connection with the signing of the Soviet-American INF Treaty that he wholeheartedly

welcomed the coming complete elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles on the global scope. However, he remarked that optimism was impermissible, that universal peace "is maintained through the balance of forces between the East and the West" and that the unfortunate U.S. has to keep its "deterrence force" despite its own economic difficulties.

Touching upon the situation in the Far East, the head of the Japanese Government urged to "realize the concrete situation", which, judging by his statements, he understands in a rather peculiar way. As though speaking on behalf of the Soviet Union, he pointed out that "even after a complete elimination of Soviet medium-range missiles, the buildup of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East will be continued both qualitatively and quantitatively". He predicted that "the situation around Japan will continue to be tense".

This speech produces strange impression. First, it distorts the real state of things and the approach of the Soviet Union to ensuring security in the region. Second, the Japanese prime minister did not suggest or even hint at anything that Japan could do by itself for lessening tension in the Far East, bringing down the level of military confrontation, consolidating peace and stability in that region and promoting trust in Soviet-Japanese relations. As for the Soviet Union, it made appropriate steps in this direction, put forward concrete proposals and initiatives. One could recall in this connection a whole package of measures proposed by the Soviet leader in Vladivostok in 1986 and a year later in his interview with the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA. Tokyo has not responded to them in any way so far. It has not put forward its own constructive proposals aimed at attaining those goals. However, Tokyo officials continually come up with statements about some "military buildup" of the USSR, a "growing Soviet threat" and so on.

The impression is that the bringing down of tension in the Far East is not among the immediate goals of the Japanese ruling circles. Military spendings have been steadily growing in Japan for many years. The 1 per cent limit on military allocations has been lifted. The restriction of functions of the Japanese Armed Forces which should be confined to the defense of the Japanese isles alone is becoming a thing of the past, which follows from a new mid-term program of the buildup of the Japanese Armed Forces. Speaking in parliament last Thursday, Tsutomu Kawara, director-general of the National Defense Agency of Japan, pointed out that the centerpiece of the program was the defense of the country's north. Perhaps, the desire to justify its own military preparations and plans to build up its military potential for years to come is the reason for Tokyo's efforts to make much of the "Soviet threat" invention. Perhaps, this is why the Japanese Government displays affected pessimism over prospects of the improvement of the world situation in general and the situation in the Far East in particular.

Commentator on Announcement of Team Spirit-88
SK310415 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 29 Jan 88

[Commentary by station commentator (Igor Lebedev) from the feature program "Today's World"]

[Text] According to reports from Seoul, the United States and South Korea will conduct the annual "Team Spirit" joint military exercise this spring. After pointing out that the announcement of their decision to conduct the 13th military game, in which approximately 200,000 U.S. and South Korean troops will participate, ended the circulation of rumors that such a military exercise would not be conducted, (Igor Lebedev), our station commentator, says:

Such rumors were circulated in Washington and Seoul. Washington and Seoul concocted this trick of pretending to discontinue conducting military exercises so as not to aggravate tension on the Korean peninsula. The hypocritical mask has been laid bare. From late February until May, the two military allies will display their military muscle on the ground, in the air, and on the sea without any limitations, as it has done for years.

Even though the planners of the "Team Spirit" military exercise describe it as having a defensive nature, the facts reject this contention and point out its provocative nature. Landing exercises that armed rapid deployment forces of (?interference) and naval, air force, and army units of the U.S. (?forces) are conducting together with the South Korean forces; (?river-crossing) operations; combat (?exercises) of tank troops; and [word indistinct] assault operations training have become common. Operations in which a so-called pre-emptive strike using [word indistinct] nuclear weapons is dealt deep into the enemy defensive area are also contained in scenarios of almost all recent "Team Spirit" military exercises. Combat operations and other [word indistinct] operations are conducted close to the borders of the DPRK, the Soviet Union, and other countries in this area. How can one say that they are not provocative operations?

One can in no way say that the "Team Spirit" military exercise is a defensive exercise. Countries in this area very suspiciously watch this annual demonstration of the military power by the United States and South Korea. International social circles believe that the militarist fever will further aggravate tension on the Korean peninsula and exercise an uneasy influence on the overall situation in the Far East.

The recent decision to conduct the "Team Spirit" military exercise was made at a time when Pyongyang had advanced a proposal for convening a North-South joint conference to pave the way for removing enmity and confrontation. The thoroughly peace-loving policy of People's Korea and the solidarity of the socialist and peace forces are faced with the adventurous lines of the imperialist forces. Public personages of the United States

are making the utmost effort to explain why the "Team Spirit" military exercise and other exercises are necessary. However, it is clear that such acts will provoke regional conflicts and endanger peace and security. This irresponsible playing with fire must end.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

PRC Urged To Open Dialogue With Vietnam
OW021000 Moscow International Service in Mandarin
1500 GMT 1 Feb 88

[(Valentinov) commentary]

[Text] In an article entitled "Open a Dialogue," the Vietnamese paper NHAN DAN discussed Vietnam-China relations. The article points out that we should not negotiate [tan pan] for negotiation's sake, and negotiation is aimed at settling existing issues. In this connection, observer (Valentinov) points out: The need to hold a Vietnam-China dialogue [dui hua] has long existed. It will be 9 years next autumn since China unilaterally suspended the Vietnam-China talks [tan pan] on the normalization of relations. As people may remember, it was in 1979 that the two countries suspended their talks. The two countries have not yet resumed their dialogue.

Since then Vietnam has more than once proposed the resumption of talks and has adopted various concrete measures to seek to ease the tense relations between the two countries, including measures to ensure security along the border between the two countries.

To create favorable conditions for resuming the talks between the two countries, Vietnamese propaganda media have recently refrained from criticizing the Chinese side for its unfriendly statements and actions toward Vietnam.

The line being pursued by the Vietnamese leadership was formulated at the Sixth CPV Congress in 1987. While talking to reporters in Ho Chi Minh City on 22 January, Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, reaffirmed this line. Nguyen Van Linh said: The Vietnamese people attach great importance to their longstanding friendship with the Chinese people. We reiterate that Vietnam is ready to hold talks with China at any time or level in the interests of both countries and in the interests of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the rest of the world.

[words indistinct] (?he sincerely) hopes for normal relations between the two countries. Here, it seems necessary to again quote what has been cited above from NHAN DAN: We should not negotiate for negotiation's sake, and negotiation is aimed at settling existing issues.

The problem here is that the Chinese side has for years said that it cannot participate in the talks because some issues have not been settled, and it will hold talks with Vietnam only when these issues are settled.

But the attitude taken by Vietnam is that the purpose of talks is to settle issues, including issues not listed on the agenda—this refers to the Cambodian issue.

Vietnam has stated more than once that it is willing to discuss this issue with China. In my opinion, when China and Vietnam act in concert, they will be able to effectively settle the Cambodian and other issues. Now Vietnam is proposing that a dialogue be held with China.

Increased Cooperation with ASEAN Advocated
OW021012 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia
1200 GMT 1 Feb 88

[Commentary by Station Observer (Shiliyaymov)]

[Excerpts] Not long ago, I read an editorial in the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA. In the article, the editor talked about his experience in meeting last year with Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted]

In an extremely important talk with the editor, Comrade Gorbachev said the Soviet Union is ready to destroy all intermediate-range missiles deployed in its Asian regions.

I think Gorbachev's call for beginning a new era of cooperation with the ASEAN nations for mutual benefit is of great significance. Up to now, Soviet bilateral relations with these countries have not been very active and have been on a very small scale. The current cooperation is so minimal that people sometimes wonder what the reason is for this. Total Soviet trade with these countries is about US \$1 billion, or only 1/50th of their trade with Japan and the United States. The Southeast Asian developing countries' markedly lopsided trade development leaning toward the capitalist powers has not only produced a dangerous dependence on the West, but has also weakened their ability to protect their own interests under the siege of neocolonialism.

Leaders of the Southeast Asian nations are well aware of this abnormal situation and are looking for new markets and new prospective partners. We Soviets believe that the time has finally come to open up a bright vista by eliminating the prejudices and misunderstandings that have blocked the road to Soviet-ASEAN cooperation. [passage omitted]

Have there been hopeful signs of progress in Soviet-ASEAN relations? I think the answer is yes. Frequent mutual visits between senior leaders have begun; mixed government-to-government committees for economic and technological cooperation have been set up; and, compared with the previous year, trade between the Soviet Union and the majority of the ASEAN nations increased last year. What is most important is that noticeable progress has been made in solving the most difficult problem—namely, the constant, drastic, and

abnormal gaps in bilateral trade that have plagued bilateral cooperation. In economic contacts, there are also encouraging signs. For instance, a major joint venture has been established in Thailand for the first time. The Thai Government has finally permitted a local shipyard to repair Soviet freighters that have been allowed to use Thai ports. Only the the freighters' number and size are limited. Similar agreements have also been signed with the Philippines. But little progress has been made at the moment because of the difficulties created by certain influential political personages. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Receives Iraqi Foreign Minister
LD022240 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1855 GMT 2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 2 Feb (TASS)—Talks took place today between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and T. 'Aziz, member of the Revolutionary Command Council, deputy prime minister, and foreign minister of the Republic of Iraq.

The ministers discussed a wide range of international problems and issues of bilateral cooperation in the light of the general directives worked out during the meeting between CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and Iraqi President S. Husayn.

A detailed discussion took place on the Iran-Iraq conflict and the development of the situation in the Persian Gulf. T. 'Aziz set out the views of the Iraqi leadership and reported on the efforts of the Iraqi side to end the war.

E.A. Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's constant principled position on the need to deflect the Iran-Iraq conflict as soon as possible onto the path of peaceful political talks with the aim of a just, comprehensive, and honorable solution. The problems existing between Iran and Iraq can and must be resolved on the basis of realism and mutual regard for interests. It was stressed that the basis for beginning the process of moving from war to peace remains UN Security Council Resolution No. 598.

The Soviet side, E.A. Shevardnadze said, welcomes the Iraqi statement on its readiness for a political settlement and for the implementation of resolution no. 598. All efforts must be directed toward implementing to its full extent this decision of the highest body of the international community. It was also pointed out that further important steps must be taken to ensure the implementation of the resolution.

In the discussion of the situation in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet side stated that the dispatch there of large naval formations by the United States and other Western Countries, by whatever pretexts this was justified, has in fact led to a destabilization of the situation and an

intensification of the threat of an expansion of military operations and the involvement of third countries in them. All this creates additional obstacles to a settlement of the conflict between Iran and Iraq and has an adverse effect on the situation in the region.

E.A. Shevardnadze explained the essence of the Soviet proposal to set up a UN naval force in the Persian Gulf. The implementation of this initiative would make it possible to reduce the intensity of military tension and to create a favorable situation for moving toward peace in the region.

The sides were in agreement in their assessment of the present mass protests by Palestinians in the occupied territories, stated their support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people, and stressed the need for an early settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict through the convening of an international conference on the Near East. T. 'Aziz supported the Soviet Union's initiative for holding consultations on this matter within the framework of the UN Security Council and examining their conclusions and recommendations at a special session of the council at the level of foreign ministers.

During an exchange of opinions on the Afghan problem, E.A. Shevardnadze gave a detailed briefing on the progress of the Geneva process for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and the prospects for its completion in the near future. He stressed that the signing in the near future of the Geneva accords would permit Soviet troops to be withdrawn from Afghanistan in a short time. At the same time it was remarked that progress at the Geneva talks is not helped by certain recent statements by the Pakistani leadership, in which an attempt is being made to avoid signing agreements with the government of the Republic of Afghanistan. For his part, T. 'Aziz spoke in support of efforts directed toward a swift settlement of the Afghan problem and welcomed the determination of the Soviet Union to withdraw its military contingent from Afghanistan.

The participants in the talks evaluated highly the state of bilateral relations, which are developing successfully on the firm basis of the treaty on friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Iraq. The prospects for development of cooperation in a number of areas were discussed.

Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, V.P. Polyakov, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium, and S.A.M. al-Faysal, the Iraqi ambassador in the USSR, took part in the conversation, which took place in a constructive and friendly atmosphere.

That same day E.A. Shevardnadze held a luncheon in honor of T. 'Aziz.

It was attended by V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the heads of a number of ministries and departments, and other officials.

E.A. Shevardnadze and T. 'Aziz exchanged short speeches.

This evening T. 'Aziz left Moscow, where he had been on a working visit.

The guest was seen off at the airport by Yu.M. Vorontsov and other officials.

Among those bidding him farewell were S.A.M. al-Faysal and the heads of the diplomatic missions of a number of Arab countries accredited in the USSR.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Meets Iraqi Official *LD021910 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT* 2 Feb 88

[Text] Baghdad February (TASS)—A meeting was held here today between Hasan 'Ali, member of the Revolutionary Command Council, general secretary of the National Progressive Front of Iraq, and the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Gaibnazar Pallayev, vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The sides noted with satisfaction the progressive development of Soviet-Iraqi relations and declared for further strengthening the relations of friendship between the peoples of the USSR and Iraq. Hasan 'Ali commended the USSR's position in favour of the earliest termination of the Iran-Iraq war and expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would play an effective role in defusing the Iran-Iraq conflict. The Soviet side confirmed readiness to give constructive assistance to international efforts to convert the conflict into the channel of political negotiations.

Meets Iraqi Parliamentarian *PM031115 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 88* *Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting has taken place in Baghdad between the head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, Gaibnazar Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Sa'dun Hammadi, speaker of the Iraqi National Assembly. During the talk, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, the sides exchanged information on the activity of the two countries' parliaments. Mutual satisfaction was expressed with the development of relations between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Iraqi National Assembly, which accords with the interests of the further consolidation of Soviet-Iraqi relations on the basis of the 9 April 1972 treaty on friendship and cooperation. S. Hammadi welcomed the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and stated Iraq's support for the USSR's efforts aimed at normalizing the international political climate and intensifying the detente process.

In discussing questions concerning the Iran-Iraq war, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed the immutability of the USSR's principled line toward its speediest ending by political means. It was noted that UN Security Council Resolution No. 598 is a real basis for achieving a just settlement of the conflict. The Iraqi side confirmed its readiness for the peaceful settlement of the conflict.

London Paper's Report

PM021247 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic
26 Jan 88 p 1

[Ghassan Shirbil Report: "Exclusive Report For AL-SHARQAL-AWSAT: Polyakov Informed Libya of Soviet Union's Satisfaction with International Conference"]

[Text] Nicosia, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT—A diplomatic report has indicated that the mission of Soviet Foreign Ministry Middle East and North Africa Department Chief Vladimir Polyakov to both Libya and Tunisia is concerned with following up developments in the region and explaining Soviet moves both within and outside the Security Council in order to provide opportunities for the convening of an international peace conference. Polyakov delivered a message from the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, to Colonel Mu'ammr al-Qadhafi.

The report said that the issue of relations between Libya and Egypt was among those broached by the Soviet envoy in his talks with officials in Tripoli. The report said that Moscow is satisfied with Egypt's emphasis on the need to convene an international conference, its refusal to resume talks on autonomy, and also its eagerness not to slip into any step that would provide cover for attempts aimed at getting round the idea of an international conference. The report added that the Soviet authorities are interested in the Egyptian position for numerous reasons: the change that has occurred in Egyptian policy over the last few years, especially its position on securing a solution to the region's crisis, and the fact that Egypt has restored "its presence at the Palestinian, Gulf, and Arab levels in general."

The report said that during his meeting with PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat in Tunis, Polyakov will broach the idea of dispatching international observers to the occupied territories. But the report indicated that available information gives the impression that "circumstances are not yet ripe for achieving such a step." The report added that Polyakov will assure the Palestinian leader that the mission of the Israeli consular delegation, which will visit Moscow, is "completely specific" and that such a step is not the beginning of the resumption of diplomatic relations between the two countries. The report indicated that the Soviet delegation will stress its country's moves aimed at convening an international conference. The report said that Moscow believes that "the time is suitable to

promote the idea of an international conference and embark on a significant step" in order to firmly establish it as the only means toward a solution to the region's crisis.

Indian Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow

PM031045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] K.P.S. Menon, Indian minister for external affairs, arrived in Moscow 2 February to take part in Soviet-Indian political consultations. He was met at the airport by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev.

Jordan's Al-Masri Supports Peace Proposals

PM021515 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jan 88
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] There is no alternative to the idea of holding a peace conference on the Near East, Jordanian Foreign Minister Tahir al-Masri said in Amman. The stands taken by Jordan and the Soviet Union coincide in this matter, the minister said at a meeting with Soviet journalists. Only Israel, backed by the United States, is opposed to such a conference, stubbornly persisting with its efforts to maintain its occupation of the Arab lands. The current uprising on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip, he noted, is fresh evidence that there can be no settlement which does not entail giving back the Arabs their ancient lands.

In this connection the Jordanian minister spoke in support of the new Soviet proposals contained in the letter from Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar and highly appraised the Soviet Union's principled support for the Arabs' just cause.

Touching on bilateral Soviet-Jordanian relations, T. al-Masri described them as excellent.

Israeli CP Criticizes U.S. Mideast Peace Plan

LD021901 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Rome February 2 TASS—Meir Vilner, general secretary of the Israeli Communist Party's [CPI] Central Committee, spoke at a regular plenum of the Party Central Committee, according to reports reaching here from Israel.

The plenum's resolution pointed out that the present-day political situation inside the country was characterized by widening polarity between the supporters of occupation and the "iron-fist" policy on the one hand and the forces of peace and democracy on the other.

Israeli public opinion was growing to realize the need for the earliest settlement of the Middle East conflict and the solution of its central problem—the Palestinian issue.

Immense military spending rested as a heavy burden on the shoulders of the country's working people, led to the further fall in their living standards.

On the other hand, the continued occupation posed a grave threat not only to the region, but to the world at large.

The withdrawal of occupation troops from the seized Arab lands, the resolution said, would contribute to achieving peace and security in the Middle East and pave the way for handling serious economic and social problems and consolidating Israel's independence.

The resolution expressed solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Palestinian people for the exercise of their legitimate rights, including the right to establish an independent state of their own alongside Israel.

The document denounced the Israeli military's bloody crimes in the Jordan West Bank and Gaza Strip. The crimes against Palestinians and violation of their elementary human rights led to deepening isolation of Israel in the international arena.

The CPI Central Committee, the resolution said, expressed support for the Soviet proposals on the Middle East which reflected the USSR's serious approach to settling the conflict in the region in a way that would meet the interests of all sides involved.

On the other hand, in a situation generated by the popular uprising in the occupied Arab territories, the recent manoeuvring of the U.S. Administration looked especially deplorable. Its plans for "Middle East settlement" represented an attempt to galvanize the ancient projects patterned on Camp David and totally ignored the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Palestinian problem.

Washington's aspirations of that kind, said the CPI Central Committee's resolution, were fraught with the further aggravation of the situation in the Middle East and harboured the threat of a new war in the region.

Demchenko Reviews Proposals for Mideast Solution
PM021551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[Article by P. Demchenko: "Near East: When a People Rises Up"]

[Text] The stormy actions of the Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied lands, which have been continuing for almost 2 months, have once again brought to the fore the question of settling the protracted Arab-Israeli conflict.

Recently it has so happened that the sharp exacerbation of the situation in the Persian Gulf and the bloody Iran-Iraq war have somehow diverted attention from this conflict, including the Palestinian problem. This view of Near East affairs has become characteristic not only of Western capitals but also, alas, of many Arab ones. Suffice it to say that the Palestinian question, which for several decades had been considered the dominant issue for Arabs, was pushed into the background at the Arab summit meeting held in Amman in November.

I am not saying this to belittle the significance of the Amman meeting and its decisions, but I wish to convey the disappointment and vexation felt by the Palestinians with whom I have talked. In the occupied territories this bitterness has still further intensified the sense of hopelessness and despair resulting from the occupation, which has now lasted 20 years, and which is accompanied by a lack of political rights and oppression of the individual, by an absence of a real prospect of liberation and also by the stagnation in resolving the Near East problem in the international arena, including the inter-Arab arena. The cup of people's patience, particularly among young people, is filled to the brim.

Meanwhile, the opinion has prevailed in Israeli ruling circles (I recently had occasion to visit that country and discuss its problems with many politicians) that Israel has no grounds for being greatly alarmed as long as the Iran-Iraq war continues and the Shi'ite "Amal" organization and the Christian al-Kata'ib in Lebanon disdain the Palestinian refugees, not stopping at the use of weapons against them.

Of course, it is not hard to notice that Israeli society is far from united now and that ferment and a split have become apparent in it, particularly after the failure of the Lebanese adventure. Today Israelis are asking themselves this question: What awaits the country in the future? Where is it going? However, such alarm over the future affects few people. It is reflected to some extent in the position of the Labor Party, but only the Communist Party calls for serious thought to be given to this. Conservative trends predominate in Israeli society as a whole. Public opinion polls have invariably named the army as the country's chief force, which is best capable of resolving its problems, intimidating the Palestinians in the occupied lands, and making them put up with the existing situation for a long time to come.

It was this self-assurance, as well as the reluctance to heed sober voices and the Palestinians' demands, that resulted in the fact that the explosion which began 9 December and which is now being called the Palestinian uprising came as a complete surprise to Tel Aviv.

It also came as a great surprise to many that the uprising by the 1.5 million Palestinian population of the occupied territories was supported by practically all the Arabs living in Israel itself. And there are almost 750,000 of

them. It had previously been thought that this generally better-off and politically less oppressed section of the Palestinians (they even have their own representatives in the Knesset) was gradually "getting used" to Israeli reality over the 40 years of the state's existence. However, feelings of solidarity with their brothers in the occupied territories have prevailed in a critical situation. "The Israeli Arabs' behavior during the revolt was a real slap in the face for Israeli society!" Ben Elissar, a prominent figure in the right-wing "Likud" bloc, exclaimed.

The Israeli authorities' response to the Palestinians' action is well known: Troops were ordered to fire live cartridges and not confine themselves to smoke pots, tear gas, and rubber bullets. It is difficult now to even state the number killed (many dozens), injured and beaten up (many hundreds), and arrested (numbered in the thousands). It seems, in addition, that the goons have decided to "pacify" the rioters by starving them: Bringing food into the rebel cities and refugee camps has been prohibited. In short, the repressive measures are increasing, but the disturbances are not dying down.

Who, then, is directing them?

Many facts indicate that they came about spontaneously, as a natural result of the protest that has built up over long years against the occupation, humiliation, and mockery, as the people's natural desire for freedom, as the expression of national feelings. And this conclusion was confirmed to me by G. Habash, general secretary of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, who said that we are seeing spontaneous actions by desperate people, not some planned action by a single organization.

At the same time, the development of events gives us the right to assume that some directing force is increasingly being felt in them. You sense this, for example, in the coincidence of slogans and demands. This circumstance has given certain journalists grounds for concluding that new centers of strength and new leaders have emerged who are not part of the PLO. It is with them, it is said, that one must have dealings. What is this? A new attempt to split the movement or a search for conciliators? Perhaps it is both.

But on looking closely at the political slogans carried by demonstrators or written on house walls and fences, you see that they fully coincide with the demands of the PLO, whose name, incidentally, is also inscribed on many banners.

The Arab League recently held a conference in Tunis of the Foreign Ministers Council entirely devoted to the Palestinian problem, which was to some extent an addition to the Amman meeting. The ministers confirmed their trust in the PLO as the Palestinian people's sole legitimate representative. It was decided to give the uprising financial assistance, with the money passing

through PLO channels. The conference approved almost unanimously (only Libya opposed it) an appeal to the United Nations to hold an international peace conference on the Near East with the participation of all the sides involved in the conflict (including the PLO), as well as the five Security Council permanent members.

This is the very same idea whose realization is advocated by the Soviet Union and which is a part of the Soviet peace plan for the Near East.

I will remind you that this plan is founded on three basic principles. First, it is necessary to recognize the inadmissibility of seizing foreign lands by means of aggression. Consequently, all the territories occupied since 1967 must be returned to the Arabs. Second, it is necessary to realize in practice the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to political self-determination. Third, it is necessary to really guarantee for all the states in the region, including, of course, Israel, the possibility of a secure and independent existence within recognized borders. The Soviet Union proposes convening the aforesaid international conference as a diplomatic form of reaching a future settlement.

What is the attitude to this conference now? We have already mentioned the Arab position. West Europe is "for" it too. FRG Foreign Minister Genscher recently said so on behalf of the EEC. China adheres to the same position.

The United States and Israel are left. Everything is more complex there. Israeli Prime Minister Shamir is categorically opposed. He believes that such a conference will be "an arena for anti-Israeli propaganda, not a framework for serious negotiations." Foreign Minister Peres takes a different stand. He favors a conference in principle, but without the PLO'S participation and on the condition that bilateral talks will be held under its aegis with Arab governments, and primarily with Jordan. His other condition is the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, which ceased in June 1967 in response to the Israeli aggression against Syria, Egypt, and Jordan and the seizure of Arab lands. Clearly, the lack of diplomatic relations is an abnormality. In my view, they could be restored during the conference, when it becomes clear that the reasons for breaking relations have ceased to exist. But it is futile to put any demands to our country in advance.

Contradictory reports are now coming out of Washington, particularly after Egyptian President Mubarak went there and proposed an "interim" settlement plan, which, in his opinion, must also lead ultimately to the convening of an international conference (the Arabs' attitude toward this plan is not at all identical).

Until now the United States has resolutely supported Israel's actions, including its opposition to any collective actions on a Near East settlement and its refusal to recognize the PLO. In fact the Israelis have perpetrated

and are perpetrating their unlawful actions under the wing of the U.S. So far there is little that attests to a change in that position. However, expressions such as "the Palestinian people's legitimate rights" and "an international conference on the Near East" have begun appearing in official statements. President Reagan recently said in an interview with the Egyptian newspaper AL-AHRAM: "The recent events on the West Bank and in Gaza have confirmed that it has become impossible to continue the policy of asserting 'faits accomplis.' We must work together with other sides in the region to give the Palestinians an opportunity to feel hope, not despair." It is difficult to say yet what lies behind those words, but it sounds quite good.... Incidentally, Western analysts believe that in election year in the United States and in Israel (in November) a sharp change in the position of these two countries can hardly be counted upon.

But events dictate their own logic and cannot be disregarded, and no time must be lost. In order to get advance the process of preparing for the conference, the USSR recently proposed beginning consultations within the framework of the UN Security Council in order to then hold a session of that organ at the foreign ministerial level. Our diplomats are actively exchanging opinions on this question with other countries, and there is obvious approval for the idea. It is also obvious that it fits into the channel of establishing peace and justice in the Near East—part of our country's overall struggle to eliminate regional conflicts.

UN's Cordovez Kabul Airport Address Reported
PM031145 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent D. Meshchaninov: "Afghanistan is Ready to Adopt a Flexible Position"]

[Text] Kabul—D. Cordovez, the personal representative of the UN secretary general, has ended his brief visit to the Republic of Afghanistan after having consultations on questions concerning the process of a political settlement over Afghanistan and the resumption of the talks in Geneva.

Addressing journalists at the capital's airport, D. Cordovez said in particular:

This is my second visit to Kabul in the past few days and during the visit I met with the country's president, Najibullah, and foreign minister, A. Wakil. Both the president and the minister assured me that the Afghan side is prepared to take part in the next round of talks in Geneva and that Afghanistan is prepared to adopt a flexible position and to make the utmost effort for their successful conclusion. I would like to thank the Afghan leadership for its hospitable reception and the elucidation of its position.

Great efforts and a great deal of patience and restraint are needed to resolve the Afghan problem. On the streets of Kabul I saw ordinary people who passionately want peace to be restored in their land. All this obliges me to spare no effort for the successful conclusion of the talks in Geneva. What further steps will be taken on the path of a political settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan will become clear after consultations in Pakistan, where I am now going.

Unlabeled Free Aid Not Credited by Afghans
PM021635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 88
Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Vadim Okulov dispatch: "How Much Is a Label Worth"]

[Text] Kabul—A column of trucks delivered free Soviet aid to an Afghan city along a road liberated from dushman gangs. The grain, produce, outerwear, footwear, and soap sent from the USSR is intended for distribution to the population. Nameless packages containing headscarves, and mattresses and blankets without labels were unloaded from the trucks; Children's sandals with barely discernible labels were thrown down loose onto a spread-out cloth.

"It can't be helped," Afghan friends sighed. "When the columns are formed products must be transferred from large packages into the containers which we have available. But we do try to explain to the population that it is aid from the Soviet Union...."

You must, however, face up to the truth: By no means everyone who distributes Soviet goods always has the opportunity and the desire to explain to people that, as always, the Soviet Union is extending them a helping hand.

The vast aid, called free, is supplied as a gift to the Afghan state. But it is not all—and this is natural—distributed to the population free. Some is sold by the authorities via the trade network—not only the poorly developed state trade network but also through numerous private stores. What merchant will begin to explain to purchasers that the goods which he has put up for sale at low prices have come from the USSR and that they are even free for the country?...

It is not the first time that our press has raised the question of the fact that the great amount of Soviet aid sent across the border to those experiencing a natural disaster or to support the population of friendly countries is often not perceived by the recipient to be Soviet aid. The overwhelming majority of goods coming from the USSR to Afghanistan lack clear labels and understandable symbols. Anonymous material and technical means are sent to the Afghan provinces from republics and oblasts linked to them by the bonds of direct patronage ties. There is an explanation for this: The goods are not part of an export order but are sent from

the backwoods, from local enterprises. What do you write on the boxes if the population for whom the aid is intended are almost universally illiterate?

If you look you can always find an excuse. There is justice in the argument that almost an entire labeling and packaging industry is necessary to resolve the problem, which costs a lot. True. But what cost can be put on and who can be held responsible for the small impact of the great efforts of many people? Above all those who, moved by a sense of international duty and compassion for a friendly people who have fallen on hard times, make sacrifices themselves and seek what we are accustomed to call internal reserves, and find and extend the hand of aid and solidarity. But in order to shake another's hand in gratitude, you must see clearly who has extended it to you and from where.

Why should we deceive ourselves: By our reluctance to spend money on labels, advertising, and symbols we do not merely lose rubles—we often weaken our authority and political prestige.

Indian Satellite to be Launched at Baykonur
LD031027 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS—In keeping with a Soviet-Indian agreement the Indian satellite IRSS is to be launched by a Soviet Vostok booster rocket next March, the Soviet space agency Glavkosmos announced.

Designed and manufactured in India, the satellite is intended for studying that country's natural resources from space.

Indian and Soviet specialists are conducting preparations for the blast-off at the Baykonur Space Port.

Gorbachev 'Likely' To Visit India in Nov
BK221523 Delhi PATRIOT in English 10 Jan 88 p 1

[By Our Special Correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, Jan 9—Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev is likely to visit India some time in November this year to receive the Indira Gandhi Prize for Peace, Disarmament and Development, according to a well informed source.

Mr Gorbachev's India visit will also coincide with the ending of the one-year long Soviet festival in India. Other details are not known.

East Europe

Urban on Public Reaction to Price Increases
LD022148 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Warsaw February 2 TASS—At a press conference here today, spokesman for the Polish Government Jerzy Urban refuted reports of the Western mass media on the reaction in Poland to the changes in the structure of prices and incomes. He pointed to the incendiary nature of broadcasts of "Free Europe" radio which is in the upkeep [as received] of the CIA.

Answering a question from journalists as to what reaction to price increases the government expects, Jerzy Urban emphasized that this is a painful but a necessary step. It is painful for a large part of the families, though the government has taken measures to protect them as reliably as possible against the consequences of price increases.

The society is living through a difficult period, but the situation is far from the one painted by "Free Europe." The Poles know and realise that prices, wages and the living standards depend on how they work, on changes in the organization of labour, on the operation of economic mechanisms.

We foresee that in answer to price increases, work collectives will be demanding wage increases, Urban said. This is natural if such a demand is corroborated by the increase of the output of products and improvement of their quality. Any other approach will entail the further growth of the inflation. The government's measures, quite the contrary, are aimed at the lowering and subsequent curbing of the inflation within the next three years.

Answering questions about the visit to Poland by U.S. Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead, Jerzy Urban said that the conversations in Warsaw were on the whole very constructive. The Polish side regards the assurances of the U.S. deputy secretary of state about the striving for progress in Polish-American relations as sincere and important. This is confirmed, specifically, by the fact that Polish Foreign Minister Marian Orzechowski was invited to make an official visit to the United States.

The Jaruzelski plan was also the subject of the talks in Warsaw. In Whitehead's opinion it contains interesting proposals of importance for the present state of East-West relations, the spokesman for the Polish Government said.

Poland's Messner Receives Broadcasting Official
LD282015 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1830 GMT 28 Jan 88

[Text] Today Zbigniew Messner, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member, Polish Council of Ministers chairman, received Aleksandr Nikiforovich Aksenov,

chairman of the Central Intelligence Directorate of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society, USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting chairman, who is visiting Poland.

During the conversation stress was laid on the importance of cooperation between friendship societies and the two countries' mass media.

On the same day Comrade Aksenov was received by Josef Czyrek, Politburo member, PZPR Central Committee secretary, and by Marian Orzechowski, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member, minister of foreign affairs. Note was made of the dynamic development of Polish-Soviet relations and the positive contribution made by the two countries' friendship societies to this process.

Briefs

Hungarian-Soviet Cultural Cooperation

Moscow, January 27(MTI)—On Wednesday the 1988 exchange programme of Hungarian-Soviet cultural cooperation was signed in Moscow by Ferenc Ratkai, Hungarian deputy minister of education and culture, and Nina Silkova, Soviet deputy minister of culture. The document calls for further exchanges of exhibitions, art ensembles, artists and delegations. An outstanding event will be the Third Hungarian theatre festival to be held in the Soviet Union from this September to April 1989. Ferenc Ratkai said the aim was to increase the efficiency of comprehensive cultural cooperation and increasingly meet the new challenges, parallel with the fostering of old traditions. There are calls to intensify direct contacts between schools, theatre companies and art communities, as well as in the field of cadre training and extension training. [Text] [Budapest MTI in English 1342 GMT 27 Jan 88 LD]

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro on Cuban Tasks in 'Correcting Mistakes'
PM021359 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 88
Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Fidel Castro Speech"]

[Text] Havana, 29 Jan—Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and president of the Councils of State and of Ministers of the Republic, has addressed the closing of the Fourth Cuban Writers' and Artists' Union (UNEAC) Congress. He dwelt on the urgent tasks facing Cuba and noted the enthusiasm with which the Cuban people are participating in the process developed under the Communist Party's leadership of correcting mistakes and eliminating negative trends.

Cuba, F. Castro said, possesses a strong party and a people whose culture is founded on the principles of internationalism and revolutionary awareness. The country can be proud of its young people. All these are Cuba's priceless treasures. Over the years of the revolution, the Republic has created tremendous moral values. Despite the negative trends that have appeared in recent years, resulting in the need to begin the process of correcting mistakes, the Cuban people are characterized by mass patriotism, internationalism, and heroism.

The speaker pointed out that it is still too early to feel a sense of complete satisfaction with successes in the cultural, scientific, and economic spheres, in the development of mass sport and education, and in other areas. We could do far more.

The Cuban leader voiced confidence that the new UNEAC leadership understands the need for the independent resolution of urgent problems, in addition to what the party, the state, and the government are doing in this sphere. There is no doubt that in the cultural sphere, as in other areas, solutions will be found to all problems, and all difficulties will be overcome. We will continue our progress.

The congress delegates adopted the UNEAC's new statutes and a plan for reorganizing its structure and elected the union's leading organs. The writer Abel Prieto was elected UNEAC president. Nicolas Guillen, Cuba's national poet, who was one of the UNEAC's founders and led it for many years, was elected honorary life president of the UNEAC.

Contras 'Infiltrated' by CIA Attack Village
LD031257 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Text] Managua February 3 (TASS)—A contra gang infiltrated into Nicaragua by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has attacked the small village San Augustin in the Central Department Boaco, killing five people, including three children, and wounding eight others, the Nicaraguan defense ministry reported.

Troops of the Sandinist Popular Army are continuing operations to mop up Somozista mercenary groups which have stepped up terrorist activities lately. The military communique said that last Monday alone 12 contras were killed in different parts of the country and regular army units captured weapons and military equipment.

Lieutenant-Colonel Ramon Calderon, chief of staff of the 5th Military District, told newsmen that one of the crew members of a plane shot down over Nicaragua last Sunday was killed after offering resistance to army troops.

The mercenary had undergone training in the United States and taken part in more than one operation to airlift supplies to contra gangs in Nicaragua. He was the leader of a group which had delivered several containers with arms and weapons to the contras.

Calderon said documents were found demonstrating that the plane was recently repaired in the United States. He added that army units are continuing to search for the other group members.

More on Contra-Sandinist Cease-Fire Talks

Nicaragua's Tinoco Comments

LD281950 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT
28 Jan 88

[Text] Havana January 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov reports:

Talks between representatives of the Nicaraguan Government and contras on cease-fire under the Guatemalan agreement on peaceful settlement of the conflict in Central America open in the Costa Rican capital today.

Addressing a press conference in San Jose last Wednesday, head of the Nicaraguan governmental delegation to the talks with contras, Nicaragua's Deputy Foreign Minister Victor Tinoco said that the Sandinist government had worked out new proposals aimed at an early conclusion of an armistice agreement. He noted that any delays in this area would lead to the continuation of bloodshed. The ceasefire is not an end in itself but just a means of bringing back the contras to normal life, Tinoco said.

At the same time, he flatly rejected the attempts of the counterrevolutionary leaders to impose on the Nicaraguan Government a discussion of questions of the country's domestic policy.

Nicaragua's efforts to conclude armistice and settle the conflict are blocked by actions of the U.S. Administration which referred to the Congress a request for appropriating 36 million dollars as new aid for the contras. If the U.S. legislators endorse new financial aid to the contras, this will be a blow at the process of peaceful dialogue in the region and gross violation of the Guatemalan arrangements, Tinoco said.

Prior to the arrival in Costa Rica, the leaders of the contras had a meeting with U.S. secretary of State George Shultz in Washington. Their stand at the talks with the Sandinist government was discussed. It should also be noted that special representative of U.S. President in Central America Morris Basby visited San Jose prior to the talks. In Costa Rica, he, specifically, tried to convince President Oscar Arias that the sum of aid for contras armament requested by the U.S. Administration is "insignificant". As is known the Costa Rican president declares against the U.S. aid for the contras since it contradicts the Guatemalan accords.

The mass media and politicians of Central American countries also comment on George Shultz's intention to tour the countries of the region if the Congress endorses the President's request for the financing of the contras. The essence of these commentaries is that the secretary of state intends to inspect the ruins of a peace dialogue after a bombshell which new U.S. aid to the Somoza bands will be.

Contras Follow 'Hard Line'

PM021405 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jan 88
Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA "Press Service" report: "'Face to Face'"]

[Text] The first "face-to-face" talks between Nicaraguan government representatives and contra leaders on the question of a cease-fire are under way in the Costa Rican capital of San Jose.

The meeting is taking place on the initiative of the Sandinist government with the mediation of three Nicaraguan priests.

"For 4 hours on Thursday the two sides discussed the problem of a cease-fire in the 7-year war which has claimed the lives of 40,000 Nicaraguans, although the prospects of an accord look extremely dim," a REUTERS correspondent has reported from San Jose.

The pessimism felt by the observers present at the meeting is well-founded. Despite the new proposals by the Nicaraguan side (according to a statement by the head of the delegation—Nicaraguan Deputy Foreign Minister V. Tinoco—his government does not intend to make a cease-fire conditional upon the immediate disarmament of the contras and, what is more, they will be permitted to remain in the zones they now occupy), the leaders of the armed gangs have taken an extremely uncompromising stand.

In exchange for a truce, they are demanding "far-reaching democratic reforms in Nicaragua" and a sharp reduction in the size of the Sandinist People's Army, while simultaneously preserving their own formations. It goes without saying that this kind of pressure is being regarded by the Sandinistas as a threat to the country's sovereignty. The Nicaraguan Government is trying to achieve a cease-fire and subsequently involve the contras in peaceful activity, but it does not intend to discuss Nicaraguan domestic policy issues with the mercenaries.

To all appearances, the contras are simply playing for time. Trying to persuade American legislators that they are working for a peace settlement, in actual fact they are waiting for one thing only—the allocation of new aid. Without this aid, their flagging forces would not be able to hold out for many months.

Recently addressing the annual conference of the U.S. Reserve Officers Association, President Reagan asked Congress for 36 million dollars to support the "freedom fighters," as he calls the contras. The head of the administration has sharply reduced his original request (which, as is well known, amounted to \$270 million), hoping that this will increase the chance of clearing it with Congress. The White House does not conceal the fact that the allocation of the sum requested is a "life and death matter" for Ronald Reagan's prestige in his final year as president.

However, the administration's maneuvers have done little to convince legislators, especially among the Democrats. "It is a gun aimed at the process of achieving a peace settlement in the region," is the description given the White House demand by Congressman-Democrat D. Bonior, who was an observer at the recent meeting between the presidents of five Central American republics held in San Jose.

Many U.S. political figures can now appreciate the absurdity of the situation. R. Reagan justifies the need for new injections for the contras by citing the "inability" of the Sandinist government to achieve a cease-fire. But how can this be achieved if the United States once again starts cramming the mercenaries with arms, thereby inciting them to new crimes?

The contras' "hard line" at the San Jose talks was therefore inspired in Washington. The administration needs this artificially created impasse in order to continue its undeclared war against the Sandinists.

Nicaraguan 'Group of 14' Refuses To Resume Talks
*LD030644 Moscow TASS in English 0621 GMT
3 Feb 88*

[Text] Managua February 3 TASS—Fourteen oppositional parties in Nicaragua refused on Tuesday to resume political dialogue with the Government of the Republic as part of the efforts aimed at fulfilling the Guatemala accords.

The Nicaraguan Government recently called on the opposition to resume talks with the national leadership. The talks stalled in December last year through the fault of the opposition which demanded political concessions and constitutional reforms. According to Antonio Bonilla, a spokesman for the so-called Group of 14, the parties will soon present to the government a draft plan for the national reconciliation of political forces in Nicaragua.

Alleged Recording of Kidnapped Colonel Released
*PY021328 Moscow Radio Magallanes in Spanish
to Chile 0200 GMT 1 Feb 88*

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Today in the Voice of the Fatherland, Lieutenant Colonel Carlos Carreno Barrea delivers his message that Carreno sent to government junta member General Humberto Gordon Rubio:

[Begin Carreno recording] I am addressing you, Gen Humberto Gordon Rubio, from the location I am being kept in captivity. I have spent the last 8 days here in deep meditation [words indistinct] I have been able to ascertain the hoax and fabrications, the tortures, and all the damage that you'r [words indistinct] from the CNI [National Intelligence Center] if your struggle is conducted with true conviction [passage omitted]. [end recording]

Political & Social

Possible Nuclear Reactor Accident Reported

Reaction to 'Follow Shortly'

LD031513 Hamburg DPA in German 1459 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Stockholm (DPA)—According to the Swedish Radiation Protection Institute, this afternoon there has possibly been another nuclear accident in the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

In Moscow a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said in answer to an enquiry by DPA that a reaction to the Swedish report would follow shortly.

Reports 'Unfounded'

LD031618 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1607 GMT 3 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 3 Feb (TASS)—Today a number of foreign information agencies, referring to various sources, in particular in Sweden, have put forward a story about a nuclear accident that they allege has taken place in the USSR. At the request of a TASS correspondent, a piece of official information was received from the USSR Ministry of Atomic Engineering that no accident has occurred at a nuclear power station in the USSR. All nuclear power stations in the USSR are operating normally. Any other reports in this regard are unfounded.

Gremitskikh Denies Story

LD031540 Hamburg DPA in German 1526 GMT
3 Feb 88

[Excerpt] Moscow (DPA)—According to the Soviet Foreign Ministry today, there has been no nuclear accident on the territory of the Soviet Union. All reports to the contrary were without foundation. Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told DPA in answer to an inquiry. Gremitskikh quoted information from the Soviet Ministry for Nuclear Energy. [passage omitted]

Toxic Spill Clean-Up Continues; 34 Hospitalized

LD021828 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Yaroslavl February 2 TASS—Effort is continued to eliminate the consequences of an accident in Yaroslavl, the centre of Russia. Several cars of a freight train, including a tank with a highly toxic liquid derailed there on the night of February 1. Medics take part in this effort alongside railway services and specialists in chemical protection.

Chief of the Yaroslavl regional health services department Vera Kuznetsova told a TASS correspondent that the matters were complicated by the fact that in the small hours medics have not yet been aware of the effects of the toxic liquid spilt on the organism. Nevertheless, the

entire medical services have been readied for operation. The lists of all persons who worked in the hazard zone were drawn up at medics' request. These persons have been recommended to undergo medical checks. Altogether 3,000 people were temporarily evacuated from the hazard zone. A team of general practitioners was examining all wishing to undergo health checks. Luckily, the concern expressed proved to be overrated. The majority of persons surveyed (more than 180 people underwent checks) had no ill effects. But Kuznetsova said that 34 persons had to be hospitalised as they showed signs of a slight poisoning.

The accident took place at a distance of 150 metres from the Volga. But due to the measures taken the liquid from the tank has not reached the river and there is no danger of the river water's contamination.

A special commission to investigate the causes of the accident continues working.

Belorussian Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM011155 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 23 Jan 88 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The ninth Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held in Minsk 22 January 1988.

The plenum heard a report on the work of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau on leading restructuring.

Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report on this question.

Taking part in the discussion of the report were R.V. Masalkova, rewinder at the Mogilev V.I. Lenin "Khimvolokno" production association; A.A. Zelenovskiy, first secretary of the Brest Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; A.S. Shchetko, young horned cattle feeding operator at the "Krasnyy Oktyabr" Kolkhoz, Stolbitsovskiy Rayon, and member of the party raykom bureau; A.A. Sanchukovskiy, general director of the Minsk "Gorizont" production association; V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of the Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; V.P. Platonov, president of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences; A.A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Minsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; S.N. Semeshchenko, production sector chief at the Kirov Kolkhoz, Shklovskiy Rayon; V.I. Akulenko, first secretary of the Glubokskiy Belorussian Communist Party Raykom; V.G. Garkun, first secretary of the Dzerzhinskii Belorussian Communist Party Gorkom; L.S. Yermachenkova, electrical relay engineer at the Kukoml GRES named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR and member of the shop party bureau; A.S. Kamay, first secretary of the Gomel Belorussian Communist Party Obkom;

Yu.D. Moroz, director of the "Belovezhskiy" Sovkhoz-Combine, Kamenetskiy Rayon; V.I. Kozyak, first secretary of the Shchuchinskiy Belorussian Communist Party Raykom; N.N. Yeremenko, chairman of the board of the Belorussian Union of Theatrical Workers; L.G. Kletskov, first secretary of the Grodno Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; V.I. Mikhasev, chairman of the Minsk Gorispolkom; Ye.D. Pyshnyak, party committee secretary of the Lenin (Berezhnoye) Kolkhoz, Stolinskiy Rayon; V.P. Polyachenok, assemblyman-fitter at the Minsk S.M. Kirov production association for the output of broaching and cutting-off machines and secretary of the shop party organization; N.A. Melnikova, chief agronomist at the "Peramoga" Kolkhoz, Zhitkovichskiy Rayon; V.S. Leonov, first secretary of the Mogilev Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; R.A. Blishech, chief of the dairy unit at the Dzerzhinskiy Kolkhoz, Rechitskiy Rayon and secretary of the shop party organization; N.Ye. Patskevich, party committee secretary of the "Integral" production association, Minsk; A.L. Grib, Belorussian SSR minister of consumer services; V.A. Pechenikov, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; G.S. Tarnavskiy, prosecutor of the Belorussian SSR; V.I. Goncharik, chairman of the Belorussian trade unions council; V.V. Gurin, first secretary of the Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee; and L.M. Chura, chairman of the board of the Belselstroy [Belorussian Rural Construction Administration].

A resolution was adopted on the question discussed.

Taking part in the work of the plenum was Ye.N. Trofimov, sector chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department.

Criminal Distributes Leaflets for Nationalists

LD022000 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 2 TASS—Sordid affairs are usually conducted by unscrupulous people. And here is yet another piece of evidence to confirm that.

A certain Sivert Zoldin, 28, was detained in Tallinn today.

Zoldin, who was convicted four times during his comparatively brief life (for theft of state property, theft at orphanages, kindergartens and schools, stealing cars, malicious hooliganism and rape), was caught as he was distributing seditious anti-state leaflets.

Militiamen who detained the recidivist first thought that Zoldin had stolen from unidentified persons home-printed leaflets taking them in the dark for banknotes.

This outwardly apparent version was not substantiated, however, as the person they arrested had distributed, rather than merely stolen the leaflets.

It turned out that Zoldin was engaged, concurrently with his criminal dealings, in "political activity" conducted in the republic by certain nationalist elements who call themselves, depending on the situation, either "human rights circles" or the "new party" initiative group.

So it happened that a thief and rapist found himself in the same company with a handful of people who would like to go against the people's will and restore bourgeois orders in Soviet Estonia, tear it away from the multinational state.

As all signs indicate, criminals and nationalists have many vital interests in common.

Law-enforcement bodies investigating Zoldin's case will undoubtedly clarify the origin of the hostile leaflets and find out who specifically contracted with the criminal for a political venture.

It is of some interest, too, whether Zoldin will be "canonized" by Western nationalist centres and mass media in the West now bent on inspiring anti-social disorders in Soviet Estonia as the 70th anniversary of the bourgeois state is approaching.

Could the distribution of leaflets by a criminal be just one event on the "celebration programme"?

Estonian Arrested for Not Answering Summons

AU022126 Paris AFP in English 2103 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb 2 (AFP)—Estonian nationalist Heiki Ahonen was arrested Monday in Tallinn, the capital of the Soviet Estonian republic, the editor of a dissident magazine said Tuesday.

Aleksandr Podrabinek, editor-in-chief of the EXPRESS-KHRONIKA, confirmed an earlier report from Stockholm that Mr Ahonen, 30, had been arrested and jailed for refusing to answer a summons to appear before military authorities.

The arrest was first reported Monday by Ulo Ignats, a Stockholm-based journalist on an Estonian newspaper.

In December Mr Ahonen appeared on a French television program called "Resistances" focusing on human rights abuses. The program's producer said Sunday that Mr Ahonen had since been beaten up by unidentified aggressors in a Tallinn street.

In Munich, an association of Soviet refugees in West Germany said the number of political prisoners in the Soviet Union had dropped by half between October 1984 and October 1987.

The association, "Das Land und die Welt", published Tuesday its yearly list of Soviet political prisoners, which is considered highly reliable.

It attributed the decrease in the number of political prisoners to the release of 291 people from jails and psychiatric hospitals between October 1986 and October 1987.

The association said the release of more prisoners since October means that there are currently fewer than 400 political prisoners in the Soviet Union.

VOA Analysis of PRAVDA Editorial Challenged

PM021505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[Article by Vladimir Petrov: "'Pamyat' And Others"]

[Text] Not long ago the radio station VOA drew its listeners' attention to an editorial in PRAVDA on 27 December 1987. It was entitled "Democracy and Initiative." Many U.S. commentators, VOA reported, saw the article as an attempt to restrict and bring under careful supervision those among the so-called informal or, more accurately, self-active groups and associations whose activities are reprehensible "in the view of the party authorities."

What groups do they mean, precisely? We asked PRAVDA writers working in the capitalist countries and they all said the same: "Pamyat," "Glasnost," and some other groups.

Leaving VOA aside, let us look at the opinions of our readers, and hear what they have to say about what is happening at home.

At home we are involved in the difficult job of restructuring. There have been many new phenomena in public life, including various self-active formations. They are beginning to play an increasingly active role—and that is a good thing. We are talking about democratization and glasnost at home and we can sense them in our day-to-day life—that is also a good thing. But, at the same time, judging by the letters the editorial office has received, people are beginning to be surprised by the fact that in some cases there have been extremist speeches in public and efforts to kindle national enmity. All this in the guise of democracy and glasnost.

The surprise, and, sometimes, alarm, are, to be frank, not unfounded. What has happened?

There are more than 30,000 self-active groups and associations in the country at the moment. We see them as being in the mainstream of restructuring. Whereas, previously, any outstanding initiative had to make the rounds of the official bodies before manifesting itself in word and action, now, since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and since the 27th CPSU Congress, everything has changed radically. And it is no accident that in various parts of the country, particularly in major centers, a variety of social, including youth, clubs and associations has appeared. They have attracted

worried people, people excited by the changes in our life. They are backing restructuring with their knowledge, experience, and energy. Their opinions are often the opinions of the public and local and central bodies listen to them.

It is a known fact that in many respects it was public opinion, public anxiety that brought about the decision to halt work on redirecting part of the flow of the northern rivers, despite the displeasure and opposition of certain distinguished officials. The public and working people are still keeping an eye on Lake Baykal and their uncompromising stance has been resolutely supported by party and soviet bodies and the CPSU Central Committee. What about the following instance—it was discussed by PRAVDA. The collective of the Tula V.M. Ryabikov Machine Building Plant obtained for the organization of subsidiary plots the neglected land of a section of the "Kultura" Sovkhoz, attached to the village of Plotnitsyno, the site of what remains of L.N. Tolstoy's ancestral home, one of the great writer's favorite places. It was there that he wrote many chapters of "War And Peace." Now the machine builders, together with the public of Chernskiy Rayon, have decided to restore the great writer's house-cum-museum. They had to knock at the door of many official bodies, right up to the USSR Gosplan, and secure the backing of Academician D. Likhachev. But in the end, through the efforts of the dedicated people who had given their free time to the project and come together under the banner of noble ideas, our country had yet another seat of culture. The Children's Foundation and Culture Foundation, the peripeteia involving the monument on Poklonnaya Hill, the strong mood against drunkenness and bureaucracy, the military patriotic and internationalist clubs, the research groups adding material to the annals of the front, the organizations fighting for the preservation of historical and cultural monuments, the youth workshops—this is a far from complete list of the good work being done by the public.

One can only welcome this. In fact, the main slogan of restructuring is: more socialism and democracy in our life. This means more initiative. As is known, it was the initiative of the masses and the desire to work in a revolutionary way that V.I. Lenin valued above all else and he taught that one should foster embryonic innovation.

But why is the editorial mail uneasy? The fact that people have started talking out loud, openly, without fear is bound to be welcomed, you might think; but, instead, they sometimes cause annoyance. Why?

One can perhaps not answer this question in full. But there is one conclusion that can be drawn. In the localities, and, indeed in the center people were ill-prepared—in practical and theoretical terms—for the

explosion of public activity and they are only just beginning to get used to it, finding it hard to abandon the "it'll come to no good" stereotype, the tough regulation of initiative, and petty tutelage of it.

We are all learning democracy at the moment. For party, soviet, and Komsomol organizations this science consists in thoroughly studying the processes taking place in various strata of the population, responding quickly and in a businesslike way to people's moods, and not being afraid of and not shunning what is new, but welcoming it. But expressing a desire for it is one thing, real practice is another matter, where life keeps on presenting unusual situations. For example, a self-active club criticizes local shortcomings in connection with, for example, the worrying ecological situation in the city. What do you do in a case like this? In frequent cases local leaders respond by using proscriptive methods, since they are still following the old stereotyped lines of thought.

In one of his works V.I. Lenin observed: "There is no need to fear the people." So where does the fear of the unconventional, the unusual come from? I believe it has come about because public opinion and the various types of debates, incidentally, not without the assistance of some mass media, including the media abroad, have targeted not the groups and associations which are really doing a useful job for restructuring without any undue noise and demagoguery, but the strident ones with their overweening ambition or those that are ill-disposed toward Soviet power and party policy. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, people have started to see other groups and associations in the same light.

It is "Pamyat" that arouses the most passion. The editorial office is still receiving "scorching" letters. "Pamyat" is preaching anti-Semitism, it is advocating "Great Russian chauvinism," is one viewpoint. Here is another: "We know 'Pamyat's' aims. They are to protect cultural monuments and fight for sobriety. Stop persecuting 'Pamyat'."

To understand the situation better let us go back to the time when "Pamyat" ["Memory"] first appeared. But what does appeared mean? We are not John Does of unknown origin—we preserve in our memory all that the people hold dear. History and our cultural heritage cannot be consigned to oblivion. This memory has always been alive and it has always had its devotees, people with an obsessive (in the best sense of the word) concern for the cultural heritage, for preserving it. Sometime in the early eighties Moscow historians, scientists, engineers, workers, and students got together at the Ministry of the Aviation Industry. Some left, others came in. They intended to get something done. With their spades and trowels they helped restore historic buildings. They came to the defense of historical and cultural monuments, sounded the alarm loud and clear, protested against the demolition of the historic part of Moscow, and inundated directive bodies with memoranda. It cannot be said that they were always supported in

everything they did nor that their efforts were always valued in the way that they deserved to be, but it cannot be denied that the people were acting honestly and selflessly. They were worried about the demographic situation in Russia, about the announcement that many Russian villages have no future and about the state of the Non-Chernozem Zone and they were distressed and upset by drunkenness and protested against it. These people are alive and well today and regret the fact that their "Pamyat" has now acquired a different reputation in the eyes of the public.

Some fundamental changes took place approximately 2 years ago. Some new people, very different from their predecessors, declared themselves leaders of "Pamyat," and they stole "Pamyat's" name. Stole is the only word for it. Vasilyev's small extremist group is operating in the name of "Pamyat" and discrediting it in everyone's eyes.

Sometimes we cannot conceive where the leaders of the self-active formations come from. Evidently there are various routes. Some just emerge, others push themselves into the leadership. The latter are pursuing various aims. Some are in the grip of the revenge syndrome: In the past my talents have not been recognized, they say, so now I will get my own back on my former "persecutors" and make myself talked about. Others dream of creating political prestige for themselves and they "boldly" uncover shortcomings in society which have already been mentioned openly in the press. But they all masquerade as supporters of glasnost.

Vasilyev, who was educated up to eighth grade, and his friends also appear before the audience in various guises. Those who have been to their meetings, for example, at the "Dinamo" Plant cultural center, have come away with the impression that they have had their ears filled with malicious anecdotes. Judge for yourselves:

"Scientists have established that kefir contains 1.5% alcohol, which means that it is profitable for certain people to turn our children into drunks...."

"We are faced with a 1941 situation and we are doing nothing about it...."

"The subway lines are laid out in such a way that one could easily blow up the most important state institutions...."

"They have built a bar and grill room in the former church in Khavskaya Street. It won't be long before they open a brothel there and start using our wives and daughters as concubines...."

The present leaders are all but making a public appeal for extremism. In the so-called "Address to the Russian People" we read: "...Make a bolder effort to find and identify the enemy's secret quarters.... Seek and bring

forth the true leaders in our midst.... Establish control over the media, find out who the venal journalists are and deal with them.... The homeland is in danger!"

Who is threatening the homeland? Zionists and cosmopolitans, Vasilyev and his cronies claim, thus attempting to arouse anti-Semitic feelings in the Soviet people. But anti-Semitism and chauvinism have always been alien to our people, to the very nature of socialism.

What is this? Ignorance or deliberate incitement? And the question immediately arises: Whose interests are they expressing and what idea are they serving under cover of the flag of restructuring? Honest people do not linger long today in the vicinity of Vasilyev and his associates. They listen for a while and leave, because Vasilyev and his associates have nothing in common with the patriotic movement's original intentions.

Incidentally, we called V. Tolmachev, deputy chairman of the All-Union Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments, and asked him whether Vasilyev and his friends were involved in work connected, for example, with the restoration of historical monuments. The reply was:

"We do not have that information."

Readers are asking: Why has the name "Pamyat" become a hostage of a small group of people? The answer is not easy either. The actual members of the society are also responsible because they said nothing when the "artist, photographer, and journalist," as Vasilyev's friends sometimes describe him, set up a phoney council and elevated to the position of its chairman a person who was on the books of a psychiatric hospital. Vasilyev has also tried to whip up interest in himself. For example, he is fond of saying that one day he, a fighter for glasnost, will be found with a fractured skull, therefore, he says, he has been forced to go into hiding and change his appearance.

It is not Vasilyev alone we are dealing with, of course. There is another worrying factor, something more serious: For fear of appearing outmoded people from the period of stagnation, we have started for some reason to be shy about calling a spade a spade. This does not do any good. An extremist is an extremist. Some newspaper articles have not only failed to clarify the "Pamyat" situation, they have, in fact, lumped everyone together. Suddenly the names of Russian, Soviet writers are associated with Vasilyev's inflammatory slogans, thus creating the impression that they are acting in concert with the extremists.

People sense that something is wrong. They are writing to the editorial office about it. Russians and people of other nationalities are writing. "Certain people among us have seen the development of democracy and glasnost as an opportunity to launch a public attack on the gains of socialism," party members V. Kurdyukov and V. Zlotko

from Odessa observed. "Vasilyev and his friends are threatening the most sacred things we have: the revolution, the friendship of the peoples."

"We have never had this before," says a letter from I. Zhukov. "We do not need that kind of glasnost and expanded democracy. It is patriotic demagoguery and speculation."

"It is perfectly clear," we read in the letters from a group of writers, "that the activity of a number of individuals patently bears all the marks of a crime. Why then, instead of being brought to book, are they obligingly given conference halls in various cities for their meetings?"

"The society's main tasks are to preserve historical and cultural monuments and fight for sobriety," a letter from A. Kunenkov, 17, says. "Fine, but why is it represented by people who like only to blab about restructuring. I believe that the prattlers and blatherers should be removed from 'Pamyat.' The purging of all superfluous elements can only benefit it."

Here is a letter from Khabarovsk: "We are in favor of memory. The memory of Aleksandr Nevskiy, Minin and Pozharskiy, Suvorov and Kutuzov, Lomonosov, Tchaikovsky, and those who gave their lives following Lenin into battle against tsarism and who carried out the revolution, the memory of the millions of Soviet people who gave their lives in the Great Patriotic War. So can we allow our memory to be sullied, can we allow people to desecrate the memory of our great forebears and the entire people? A thousands times no!"

Similar thoughts were expressed by workers from the Likhachev Truck Plant in Moscow who, as has already been reported in the press, met with Vasilyev's group. Readers are proposing that "Pamyat" should shed the small group of leaders who have no right to represent it. They are proposing the restoration of "Pamyat's" good reputation. They are advising party organizations, in conjunction with labor collectives, to act more vigorously against people who go in for incitement. Involve scientists and propagandists in this, they advise. Do not avoid debate.

The fine, patriotic deeds of the self-active groups and associations in the country are being compromised not only by Vasilyev.

For some time now the West has admired the typewritten bulletin GLASNOST. S. Grigoryants, who, incidentally, is a convicted criminal and anti-Soviet, regards it as his brainchild. Let us look at a few issues. Articles remarkably familiar to a reader of the Western press on the theme of "human rights violations" and "political prisoners" in the USSR. They could be reprints. Frankly, one even feels a bit queasy when one sees the word "glasnost" on the front of this rubbish. For example, the bulletin sobs over the fate of a "prisoner for freedom,"

yet this "prisoner" is serving a sentence for embezzling socialist property or, to put it simply, for theft. The bulletin publishes an "Open Letter" allegedly from some unemployed people in the USSR who have suffered for their principles, for criticizing and combating bureaucracy, whereas the "sufferers" are actually inveterate ne'er-do-wells and violators of discipline.

Who is behind this bulletin? The precise answer to this question was given by a Western commentator who described it as a supplement... to the White emigre newspaper RUSSKAYA MYSL. But then there is a letter from one of the anti-Soviet centers in Frankfurt-am-Main: "Dear so-and-so! If you need help we will give it you without fail. If you have problems write or telephone. We would be very glad to set up a branch in Moscow."

Of late Muscovites are finding small leaflets on lamp posts, in dark alleys, and in their mailboxes calling on all "who support democratic reforms" to stage demonstrations.

They are signed: Seminar "Democracy and Humanism." What does this seminar want? It is not happy with the USSR Constitution and demands that it be revised, it demands that the article [of the Constitution] and the corresponding articles of the Criminal Code dealing with the Soviet citizens' obligation to work be amended. Another thing. They demand total deideologization in the USSR. What do they want to do? The Soviet people, they claim, have traveled the wrong path during the past 70 years, it is necessary to find a way out of the impasse. In a leaflet pegged to the Great October jubilee they wrote: "The physical annihilation of dissidents began during the first post-October months. Food requisitioning detachments robbed and killed peasants, workers were arrested and shot for striking, war communism was raging."

Nothing that the people treasure is considered sacred. It is true, these people are using the words "fatherland," "the people," "restructuring." They seem to be advocating glasnost and acting as champions of the people, but what they fear most is glasnost and the people. That is why they skulk in dark alleyways.

What do they really want? The West is prompting: It is necessary to unite, to create a united political platform, to seize the initiative. And there have been attempts at such a unification, in August of last year. True, their organizers from the club of social initiatives and other groups did not succeed. The conference ended with a... scandal. Ambitions were unleashed as to who should "bear the palm," they were grabbing the microphone from each other's hands on the rostrum, and even those who until the day before had been under the spell of the "idols" suddenly saw them in the true light. "We have been misled," a sober voice rang out.

Misleading has become the rule of good form among them. They mislead each other, they mislead the audiences that applaud the "revelations" of the newly fledged leaders, although if you regularly read the Soviet newspapers, you can work out that many of the "revelations" have been gleaned from these newspapers. They also mislead their friends across the ocean by describing themselves as a political force. Alas, certain foreign diplomats and journalists have swallowed this bait. Incidentally, they are the same people who in the past were fond of hanging about near the trash cans. But times are changing, as the saying goes. They now give preference to various "seminars." Who are these people? They are Susan Wagner and Richard Stevenson, second secretaries of the political department at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, and DPA and AFP correspondents Nathe and Kofman [latter name as published]. We will not argue about their taste, their names have just come to mind.

...Several groups have been named here. Some people might gain the impression that there are many opponents of our way of life, that there are many anti-Soviet agitators, and that their ranks are swelling. This is by no means the case. The aforementioned groups number between 10-15 members. Add to this a certain citizen who describes himself as a representative of the notorious anti-Soviet "People's Labor Alliance" (NTS), with which he maintains contact.

Let me reiterate, there are more than 30,000 interest groups and associations in the country. The overwhelming majority of them actively promote restructuring with their initiative, practical proposals, justified criticism, and concrete actions. But as the saying goes, every family has its political freaks. Should we close our eyes to this? Should we pretend that nothing is happening? Our readers rightly think that we should be principled in the assessment of developments and that we should frankly distinguish between Soviet people's genuine social activeness and political extremism in the shape of insincere behavior, outbursts of petit bourgeois mentality, and anti-Sovietism.

The task is to utilize the energy of interest associations for noble aims in the interests of society. The most important thing here is conducting patriotic international education and persuading people of the correctness of our socialist ideals with the help of the power of public opinion, and if necessary, also the power of the law.

As for the VOA interpretation of the PRAVDA leader, we would like to ask VOA's contributors: "Why this concern all of a sudden?" We will calmly sort everything out in our own house, and you may rest assured that we will be able to distinguish between disinterestedness and incitement.

'Extremely High' Crime Level Reported

LD300240 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 2040 GMT 29 Jan 88

[From the "Vzglyad" program; correspondent's report on press conference held by the USSR Procurator's Office 26 January in Moscow; shown addressing the meeting are A.F. Katusev, deputy procurator general of the USSR; M.N. Vazhenin, assistant to the procurator general of the USSR; and V.I. Andreyev, senior assistant to the procurator general of the USSR]

[Text] A few days ago the USSR Procuracy held a meeting with journalists. Attending it were the leaders of a number of directorates and departments. Our correspondent (Andrey Shepilov) was at that meeting and prepared the following reportage:

[Katusev] It has to be stated bluntly that the situation in the country as regards adherence to legality remains extremely strained. Certain positive shifts which have appeared in the dynamic and structure of criminality provide no grounds at all for complacency. The crime level is still extremely high. As before, it is negative phenomena such as drunkenness, drug addiction, parasitism, recidivism, and selfish motives which determine its prevalence and nature. Over 9 months of last year there was an increase in the number of premeditated murders in the Ukraine; Kazakhstan; the Latvian, Armenian, Tajik and Kirgiz Union Republics; and a number of oblasts in the Russian Federation. In the first 6 months of last year alone losses due to embezzlement of state and public property came to over R122 million.

I shall not bore you with figures describing the work of the investigatory apparatus and the procuracy bodies. They are not very easy to take in. I think it would be better to mention several specific cases to further illustrate the existing situation.

Last year the investigatory section of the USSR Procuracy ended its inquiries into a number of major criminal cases presenting an enhanced public danger. They were, in particular, the case of Brovin, former assistant of the former general secretary of the party, whose sentence was reported by IZVESTIYA. Our investigators have also completed the case concerning the charge of bribe-taking brought against Karavayev, former minister of the automotive industry and, together with him, 13 people who had received bribes totalling R1.5 million and the case of (Mikhotsevich), who murdered 38 women. As concerns the Churbanov case, I can announce in addition that investigatory procedures against him have been completed. Churbanov, who is charged with receiving bribes totalling more than R650,000 and abusing his official position, is currently acquainting himself with the case materials, after which the case will be referred to court.

At a recent collegium of the USSR Procuracy, which was also—thank you—covered by our television, we examined a matter which was likewise hushed up and

reflected nowhere, neither in the press nor anywhere else: the fact that we have orphans, that we have abandoned children, that we have what are known as refused children, etc. There are 700,000 adopted children, which means 700,000 abandoned. Ninety percent of children in residential establishments suffer from mental illnesses. Every year 20,000 orphans commit crimes. I shall mention just one example: The number of premeditated murders and rapes committed in 1987 was almost four times greater than the number of investigators working on those cases. That is just two categories of case: murder and rape. But we also have major thefts, abuses, bribes. There are masses of such crimes. Thus, the investigators are laboring hard; the procurators are laboring hard.

[Vazhenin] The workers of the law enforcement bodies insisted on introducing harsh criminal prosecution measures for prostitution. More sober minds, however—and they turned out to be correct—showed convincingly that the subject-matter of evidence for prostitution is very very difficult, which you yourselves have just emphasized here. So far, by using administrative measures against prostitutes, we are seeing that the work experience gained by our bodies is still very, very small. This question of subject-matter is very complex, and introducing a criminal law would not have produced any real result in the fight against prostitution. The main point of introducing this law consists, comrades, in publicly stating within the framework of our state, that prostitution is a phenomenon requiring measures both of public sanction and state compulsion, and that is must be combated openly and officially - that's the main thing.

[Andreyev] As for smuggling, you're probably in agreement with me, though I am probably swimming against the current. Smuggling is indeed a crime in our country, a state crime with punishment of up to 10 years. What is it they smuggle out? I have a list here: Vereshchagin's painting "Mountain Road," (?Sokhodolskiy's) "Birch Grove"—literally one item by each, one each, and those people painted a lot—Kuyndzhe's "Lunar Evening," which is worth a fantastic amount, several of Ayvazovskiy's paintings, Repin, Levitan. All this has passed abroad. It's worth millions. Further down the list, works by Faberge also worth a huge amount, a silver box, a unique object, one of its kind, and now it's gone. They disappear abroad, and they are worth millions.

What does the smuggler get for them? Money? They don't need money. They get clothes. Cheesecloth used to be popular, so they brought in cheesecloth from abroad; they take watches of makes nobody wants; they took jeans, and now they are taking electronic equipment. They take mere togs in exchange for such valuables. There should be harsher punishments for such crimes.

Law Bans Consideration of Anonymous Complaints
LD021410 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT
2 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS—Anonymous complaints and suggestions will no longer be considered in

the USSR, in keeping with a decree of the Presidium of its Supreme Soviet (parliament).

It has resolved to supplement Article 1 of the decree of April 12, 1968, on the procedure of examining proposals, requests and complaints by citizens, which was later edited in the decree of March 4, 1980, with Clause 3 saying:

"A written address by a citizen shall be signed by him or her, mentioning his or her name, surname and patronymic, and, apart from the substance of a proposal, request or complaint, shall contain also data such as the place of his or her residence, work or study.

"An address lacking this data shall be deemed anonymous and not be subject for consideration."

Line Outside Liquor Store Photographed

PM011629 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 23 Jan 1988 in its Morning Edition carries on page 2 under the headline "Photographic Reportage with a Bias" an unattributed caption accompanying two photographs. The first on the left shows liquor department manager N. Zdykhalskaya in her empty Smolensk store, store No 6, which the journalist managed to enter without any difficulty because the shelves were empty of liquor. The second on the right shows a line "3-4 hours long" of people waiting to buy vodka at Smolensk store No 13. The line is so long that the photographic correspondent was "unable to get it all in the photograph even using a wide-angle lens." The correspondent wanted to take a picture of the "genuine madness" in liquor store No 13 but was unable to enter the store.

The caption criticizes officials in Smolensk for constantly reporting victories in the fight against alcoholism, such as the closure of five vodka bottling lines, when at the same time "20,000 cases of vodka were brought in from Orel Oblast on the eve of the New Year." Store No 6's liquor section, it says, has reduced its monthly turnover to R75,000. "Yet store No 13's monthly planned turnover for last December was... R720,000." Thus "the semblance of an anti-alcohol campaign is kept up by silence in one liquor store and long lines at another."

Arrangements for 1989 Census Outlined

PM291341 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
17 Jan 88 p 4

[Interview with N.S. Shvartser, deputy chief of the USSR State Committee for Statistics Population Statistics Administration, by A. Alekseyev: "Census Program"; first paragraph is unattributed introduction]

[Text] In exactly a year's time, 12-19 January 1989, an All-Union Population Census will be held in the country. How will it be organized? Our correspondent met with

N.S. Shvartser, deputy chief of the USSR State Committee for Statistics Population Statistics Administration, and asked him to answer a number of questions.

[Alekseyev] First I would like to know what are the aims and tasks of the forthcoming All-Union Population Census.

[Shvartser] The fullest information about the population can only be provided by censuses, and preparations must be made for them in advance. Their importance is evidenced by the fact that even in only the 3d year after the October victory, in August 1920, the first Soviet population census was held, combined with an agricultural census and a brief listing of industrial enterprises. It was the first accurate social portrait of the young republic.

Census data about population numbers and makeup is of tremendous significance for planning the country's social and economic development. In drawing up plans for improving the people's material well-being and cultural standards and opening up new regions, it is necessary to know about not only the extent of natural resources, industrial capacities, and land fertility, but also human resources. Consequently, accurate information is needed about how the population is distributed over the territory of the Soviet Union and where there are surpluses and shortages of manpower.

In order to plan the output of consumer goods and organize kindergartens, creches, schools, and other establishments, data is needed about population numbers and makeup in terms of sex and age. Data about the level of education in any particular region will suggest how many higher educational institutions need to be built, how many specialists need to be trained, and how many books need to be produced. In addition, it is impossible to publish newspapers and textbooks in national languages or to open national schools and theaters without knowing the national composition of the population and how many people speak which languages of the USSR's peoples.

Demographic information is of tremendous importance for fulfilling the Food Program, and it is impossible to plan housing construction and the social sphere without data about the numbers and structure of families and their living conditions. The census will both reflect the present-day state of the family and make it possible to assess its future development.

In brief, the forthcoming All-Union Census will make it possible to trace the changes in the makeup of the country's population in the 10 years that will have elapsed since the previous census. Its materials will serve as the basis for compiling economic and social development plans for the 13th 5-year plan and the longer term.

They will provide the opportunity to single out population groups for which society's concern is particularly important, and they will show the areas where things are still not always going well.

[Alekseyev] How will the population census be organized?

[Shvartser] An individual survey will be carried out by specially trained workers called recorders. A sector of territory will be defined for each of them (for example, a street, a district, a multi-apartment building, or part of such a building)—the recording sector in which he is to carry out the census. People will be questioned only where they live, not at work or on duty, and moreover they will be questioned where they actually live regardless of housing permits and rights.

The recorder will come to your house at least twice, the first time just before the census, during a preliminary round of his sector which will extend over 5 days, from 7 through 11 January. The recorder will compile a complete list of all the living accommodations in his sector and will clarify at what time it is most convenient to question those living in this or that apartment, building, or premises. Each recorder will have a certificate and a special badge.

Your next meeting with the recorder will take place actually during the census itself—on one of the days between 12 and 19 January. The recorder will put a number of questions and will then record the answers on the census list.

In addition, between 22 and 26 January a supervisory inspector will check with the recorder that the recorder has not omitted anybody and, if there is any doubt, how accurately he has recorded the answers. However, such inspection tours will only take place selectively.

The same census procedure will be adopted in student, workers', and other hostels.

Citizens in hospitals, maternity homes, sanatoria, rest homes, hotels, kolkhoz homes, accommodation for visitors attached to institutions, and other accommodation intended for temporary visits will be questioned during the first day of the census—12 January.

Those who will be traveling on the night of 11-12 January will be questioned by special teams of recorders waiting for passengers before departure or takeoff or during their long-distance train journeys. Passengers on ships at sea will be questioned on board and the information collected will be radioed to the shore.

If somebody from your family is not at home when the recorder comes round, the latter can record data about him from what the other members of the family say, but

on condition that they can give all the necessary information about him. Otherwise the recorder has to come back and question him in person.

[Alekseyev] Why was this particular date—12 January—chosen?

[Shvartser] The dates of censuses in different countries vary greatly, and that is no accident. People try to conduct a census at a time when people are moving round less. Consequently it is easier to find them at home. In India, for examples, a census is conducted in March, when the rainy season is over but the summer heat has not yet begun. In Turkey the traditional time for a census is October: By this time those who have gone away for the summer are returning home.

In our country, statistics show that people move around comparatively less in January. In addition, for some calculations it is important that the information about the population is obtained as close as possible to the start of the year. In choosing a date for the start of the 1989 census, we had to exclude the first 10 days of the month when the schoolchildren are on vacation. At this time students often leave their permanent place of residence. We also had to leave out Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays, and Mondays, when people are more mobile than on other days of the week. Thursday 12 January was chosen from the remaining days for the beginning of the census.

There are exceptions to this general rule for regions with which communication is difficult in January. Thus, the census will be held early in some regions of the Far North and some mountain regions the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics.

It must be borne in mind that, in a huge country such as ours, big changes occur even in one 24-hour period. Suffice it to say that every minute up to 10 new citizens come into the world. For this reason not only the day but also a precise moment has been fixed for the 1989 census—midnight on 11-12 January. To put it figuratively, a sort of instantaneous photograph of the population is being made.

So the population census will last 8 days, from 12 through 19 January. However, it must be remembered that the recorder will record information about people living or staying with you on the basis of the situation at midnight on 11-12 January.

[Alekseyev] What are the special features of the new census and the differences compared with the previous one?

[Shvartser] Primarily it should be noted that social changes in the life of our society are reflected in census documents. Thus, both work in cooperatives and individual labor activity are provided for in the possible answers to the question about sources of livelihood.

For the first time in the postwar period special questions about living conditions have been included in the questionnaires. Here the period of construction of the building, the material of the external walls, the type and amenities of the accommodation, and the dimensions of the area occupied are taken into account. On the basis of these data it will be easier to tackle the task of providing every family with an individual apartment or house with amenities by the year 2000.

The fact that the new census embraces the whole population and that its program is standard for every inhabitant of the country can be regarded as one of its special features. Moreover, trust in people is the most important principle of this all-union survey. All the information is being recorded from what those questioned say, and no documents are required in confirmation. For example, according to the principles of Soviet ethnographical science, a person's allegiance to this or that nation or ethnic group is based on self-awareness. It is for this reason that in the census the nationality and native language stated by the actual person questioned are shown. Also, marital status is to be considered irrespective of whether the marriage is registered or not.

In addition, it is essential that everybody knows that information about specific people or families obtained through the census is not and cannot be linked with any administrative measures: neither with the distribution and utilization of living space, nor with permits, nor with other, similar kinds of questions. Census workers are forbidden to inform anybody at all of the content of the personal information they collect, recorded in the questionnaires. Afterward this information is to be used only in a collated and generalized form. Thus, the census does not affect either the personal or property rights or the interests of specific citizens.

[Alekseyev] How will the material collected be processed?

[Shvartser] The census lists have been prepared in such a way that, when they have been filled in by the recorder and after a small amount of tidying up work, they can be fed into a computer. Thus the processing of all the documentation and the compilation of special statistical materials will be much accelerated. A census provides a tremendous amount of information. The overall number of different tables obtained after processing census materials runs into hundreds of thousands, with dozens of indicators in each of them. Altogether, the result of calculating the census results several tens of millions of indicators will be obtained. This will take 18 months even with the assistance of powerful computers. As a comparison: The results of the previous census were only obtained after 2 and 1/2 years.

[Alekseyev] A complex measure such as this obviously requires a great deal of preliminary work?

[Shvartser] Of course. Preparations for the 1989 census have already been going on for several years. Primarily, a program for conducting the census has been elaborated. It has already undergone a practical test in two trial population censuses: in December 1986 in 10 of the country's rayons with an overall population of around 800,000 people, and in July 1987 in one Moscow rayon embracing approximately 10,000 people. The experiments enabled us to find out how suitable the form of the census document is, whether the instructions for filling it in have been correctly compiled, and whether the organization and methods of the census are suitable. Thereby all the difficulties which may arise during the conduct of the census and the processing of its materials have been considered.

Of course, it will be impossible to conduct the census using the resources of the statistical organs alone. So around 800,000 specially trained recorders from enterprises and organizations will be called in to help us. The population census will indeed be the business of each and every one of us.

Civil Aviation Official Interviewed on Aeroflot
PM021313 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
2 Feb 88 p 4

[Interview with L.V. Ilchuk, chief of the Ministry of Civil Aviation Main Administration for Aviation Work and Transport Operations, by SELSKAYA ZHIZN: "Aeroflot's Guarantees"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] New provisions in the rules for passenger shipments on internal air lines came into force 1 February. At SELSKAYA ZHIZN's request they are described by L.V. Ilchuk, chief of the Ministry of Civil Aviation Main Administration for Aircraft Work and Transport Operations.

[Ilchuk] The innovations mainly concern the passenger services sphere. We have simplified the sale of airline tickets. Now a person will be able to buy an aircraft ticket without documentary proof of identity. His passport details can be entered on a tear-off coupon later, at a convenient time before take-off. These details will be checked at the airport.

If a flight is delayed through Aeroflot's fault the passenger will now be paid financial compensation. In what cases? When "surplus" tickets are sold for an aircraft, or if an airliner with a smaller number of seats is unexpectedly sent for the flight; if a ticket shows the wrong flight number, date, time, or departure airport; if the flight schedule or route are changed after the ticket has been acquired, and also if the procedure for passenger registration, baggage handling, and special control is violated; finally, if these reasons have prevented the passenger from reaching his airport of destination on time.

Now about the sum of compensation for the time lost. If the passenger's departure has been delayed for the above reasons for 2-4 hours, he will be given 10% of the ticket's cost, if he is delayed 4-6 hours he will be given 15% and if he is delayed for more than 6 hours—25%. In addition Aeroflot is obliged to send the passenger to whom compensation has been given by the earliest flight, when there are free seats on it, using his expired ticket.

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN] When the delay is caused by weather conditions the matter is clear—Aeroflot is not to blame here. But surely any negligence or blunder can be concealed from the passenger behind a screen of enigmatic technical reasons?

[Ilchuk] I will answer you. Delays for technical reasons are strictly defined by instructions. They are above all malfunctions on airliners, the icing up of the runway, and interference in radio communications. In these cases as yet no compensation will be paid for the delay of the flight. But work on Aeroflot's liability to passengers will be continued.

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN] What is the reason for the repeal of the privileges for students?

[Ilchuk] These privileges were introduced to fill aircraft at a period when the flow of passengers was declining, but now airliners are filled in both winter and summer. Last year Aeroflot was unable to provide tickets for nearly 15 million people who wanted them.

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN] But would it not be better to open additional flights on routes under strain?

[Ilchuk] We would be pleased to do this. But unfortunately we are tied by the stringent limit on fuel assigned to Aeroflot by the USSR Gosplan. Alas, this year matters with regard to tickets will be no better. We will be unable to satisfy at least 15 million people. That is why where possible where there are other means of communication the number of local airlines will be reduced. But in remote regions, where there are no railroads or highways, air services will be expanded. In 1988 there will be a 15% increase in the volumes of air transport operations in the Far East, the North, Kamchatka, and Sakhalin.

Commercial Fishing Banned in Sea of Azov
LD311450 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT
31 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Yevseyev:

There will be no more commercial fishing in the sea of Azov starting this year. This decision was specially taken to restore the fish stock and to improve the ecological situation in this unique sea.

People used to say about the Sea of Azov: Fish is packed here as in a barrel. Only 50 years ago it yielded 50 per cent more fish than the North Sea, 700 per cent more than the Baltic sea and 2,400 per cent more than the Black Sea. What is important, fisheries here mainly consisted of valuable sturgeon species.

The situation, however, started to change fast, and not for the best, when part of the water of its tributaries—the Don and Kuban—was diverted to meet the needs of irrigation and the economy. The level of the Sea of Azov is largely maintained by water from the Black Sea which comes here through the Kerch strait. As a result its salinity has sharply increased, affecting many species of fish in Azov. It also attracted jelly-fish which headed here from the Black Sea in great numbers. The latter ate plankton, which supported small fish, which, in its turn, was eaten by larger fish. The ecological balance was disrupted causing the catches of valuable fish to dwindle from 90,000 to 5,700 tonnes.

Concerned with the catastrophic state of the fish stock in the Sea of Azov, the Soviet public demanded immediate and concrete measures to save it. This brought about the project of building a huge, 4.5 km dam on the narrow Kerch strait, which links the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea.

However, debates and discussions made it clear for scientists and specialists that it was meaningless to commit huge funds into the project of "controlled sea". To restore the fish stocks to their former abundance, it is much easier to ban commercial fisheries in the Sea of Azov and start fish farming projects. No doubt, measures will be taken to replenish it with fresh water to drive back the jelly-fish—the "unwelcome guests" from the Black Sea.

Reform of Technical-Vocational Schools Viewed

LD292300 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1450 GMT on 29 January broadcasts a 45-minute program, the fourth in a series entitled "The School—Problems of Perestroika" presented by journalist V.V. Vishnevskiy. The presenter begins by noting that the purpose of this program is to review earlier installments, to present some of the views expressed in listeners' letters, and to try to sum up the main strands of public opinion on the question of educational restructuring. The video shows Vishnevskiy sitting in a studio, with video inserts, some taken from earlier programs.

Vishnevskiy considers various educational issues, noting that technical equipment provided at vocational training schools is out of date compared with the equipment actually used in factories. Who provides the equipment that kolkhozes are supposed to make available to the schools attached to them, he asks? Education must be made a national priority, he adds, if reform is to be seriously contemplated.

After a video insert showing a meeting that took place on a kolkhoz in Turkmenistan a year ago, S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, tells the story of how the kolkhoz chairman was fired for concentrating only on production matters and ignoring the social aspect of his work—in this case, to make adequate provision for the farm school.

Vishnevskiy goes on to say that the entire question is one of attitude: does each person exist to serve society, or does society exist to serve him? Other issues emerge from video clips shown: kolkhozes may not be able to find the money to adequately finance their schools, especially since they have to maintain other social services and financial autonomy is making them more cost-conscious. What happens to the school if the farm runs out of money? Why should the school be dependent on the farm? Teachers' salaries have been raised, but nothing has been done to improve the material situation of schools. Why does the financing of schools have to be so fragmented? Would it not be better to have a central state fund for schools? In reply to a question from Vishnevskiy about how schools are to be financed, since the state can only presently allocate 3% of the budget to school provision, Igor Mikhaylovich Golovkov, first secretary of Moscow's Kirovskiy Raykom, says that in his rayon quite a lot has been done to improve the material and technical base of schools, including the provision of computers: 40 out of 72 schools now have computer rooms, and 20 of them were installed last year, when 5 new schools were also built. Asked about the need for differentiation between secondary schools and vocational-technical schools, Golovkov replies that some of these two kinds of schools are already cooperating and sharing facilities and teachers.

Further calls for centralization are made in video clips, in particular, for the abolition of republican ministries of education: all schools should be run by the USSR Ministry of Education. Attention also focuses on the value of vocational training: a Moscow educationist says that less than 10% of vocational school students actually take up the jobs for which they were trained.

S.M. Romanko, first secretary of Stavropol Kray's Kirovskiy Raykom, describes improvements that have taken place on a kolkhoz 1 year after the farm's equipment was criticized by a student brigade working there.

Academician Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, then fields a number of questions sent in by viewers. If Soviet schools are as excellent as they have always been claimed to be, why reform them? Velikhov replies that because of a lack of public support and attention to teaching, schools have lagged behind the development of society instead of blazing the trail, which is their proper function. He makes a plea for the massive introduction of computers into schools—not just as teaching aids: the teachers should themselves make use of computers in running the school and thus set an example of good practice to the

rest of society through their students. A video insert then expresses complaints about the cumbersome and unreliable nature of school computers and the lack of service personnel in Turkmenistan. Velikhov says that the government has decided that 500,000 personal computers will be supplied to schools during the current 5-year plan period.

Asked if he fears that Soviet schools concentrate too much on producing technocrats, neglecting aesthetic and moral education, Velikhov replies that the computer is just an instrument: it does not determine the content of the curriculum.

Summing up the opinions received during the making of the program and from viewers' letters, Vishnevskiy says that while criticizing many aspects of school provision and organization, people have warned against throwing the baby out with the bath water: the solid achievements of Soviet schools cannot be ignored. About 80% of viewers thought, however, that schools' difficulties with their material and technical base could be solved through concentration of resources within a single education system, educationists should work out a totally new concept of the Soviet school, involving a greater devolution of power to republican ministries of education and to headmasters. About 80% of viewers thought that schools should emphasize the arts and aesthetic subjects. This is because they fear technocracy and computerization and look to the humanities to provide moral education. Everyone takes the view that teacher-training must be improved. With that, Vishnevskiy concludes the program, saying that there will be another program in February.

Viewers Discuss Restructuring, Literature

LD311543 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 31 January carries a 1-hour phone-in discussion on aspects of literature today. The program is chaired by V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Union of Writers Board. The participants are V.S. Rozov, A.A. Mikhaylov, R.I. Rozhdestvenskiy, Tu.T. Gribov, P.L. Proskurin, and Ye.A. Isayev, secretaries of the USSR Union of Writers, each of whom answers viewers' questions in his own area of competence.

Karpov opens the discussion by stating that unlike industry or agriculture, where restructuring will only show results after a few years, literature is already reflecting its impact. "For instance, there are none of the cruelties of censorship which occurred before and which hampered writers a great deal, to be frank about it. All subjects are open; there are no closed subjects." Many works formerly unpublished are now in print. Glasnost and democratic methods provide writers with great opportunities in their work.

The panel then begins the question and answer session. Following remarks by Proskurin regretting the dearth of positive heroes in contemporary works, Karpov mentions the problem of blank pages of history, expressing concern that they should not be filled in just with black paint, but in an objective fashion without being necessarily negative. Rozov subsequently talks about publicistic plays such as those of Shatrov who, he adds, is helping restore Soviet historiography from its "catastrophic state." "The thing is that we don't have any history. We have Karamzin, who is now being published in the MOSKVA journal; we have Solovyev, who is also being published; and Klyuchevskiy is coming out, but there is no Soviet history. Nor could there be any, because they were forced to write it in the way that someone wanted it to look. There is no real history."

Asked whether there is any need to manage literature at all, Karpov explains that management should be understood not in the administrative sense but in the sense of providing writers with information and backup services.

Following a lengthy discourse by Mikhaylov on the relationship between literature and criticism, Gribov replies to questions on publishing affairs, in particular "many questions" on whether Brezhnev's books "Malaya Zemlya" "The Virgin Lands" and "Reminiscences" are to be stripped of their Lenin Prizes. Gribov says that this is up to the prizes committee, adding that although the books are not outstanding works they do no harm. There were, of course, many writers who were far more worthy of such recognition at that time, "but we have to be aware of why it happened—the stagnant years, the cult." This issue must be reviewed, as well as "prizes in general which, to put it mildly, were received by people for things they shouldn't quite have received prizes for."

Another question concerns cooperative publishing houses. Mikhaylov explains that experience has shown that they would not improve the situation because they would be competing for the paper in such short supply. The decision has been made however, to allow writers to publish works at their own expense, and the press will carry details on how to go about this.

Rozhdestvenskiy, who is responsible for the union's international contacts, comments that restructuring has made it easier to communicate with foreign colleagues. "Whereas before a lot of time and energy was spent dodging questions or giving indistinct answers, this no longer happens. There was a certain range of questions which were considered provocative, but in my view there were not provocative. They were asked by people who wanted to hear about things first hand."

Rozhdestvenskiy moves on to the subject of Vysotskiy, explaining to viewers that his lyrics remained unpublished for so many years "because he probably wasn't liked by those on whom it depended." Vysotskiy was

never accepted into the Union of Writers because he had never applied, despite rumors to the contrary. Now, however, with glasnost and restructuring things are different.

Objecting to a remark by Rozov about personal tastes in literature, Proskurin states that "literature has never been a personal affair in Russia, and let us hope that it never will be. It is always a state affair." He then criticizes Kazakh Television for failing to screen a film about a recent visit by members of the USSR Writers Union to the Kazakhstan branch, which, he states is split into two factions, those who support Olzhas Suleymenov, first secretary of Kazakh Union of Writers, and those against him. "If that's glasnost, then I don't know what glasnost means."

Karpov reads a question asking why writers failed to speak out before the glasnost era began. Karpov rejects this view: There were many who painted a rosy picture, but there were very many honest writers as well. He then points to the example of himself: as chief editor of NOVYY MIR before glasnost he received thousands of letters from readers praising the journal for its content. The saying that the writer is the people's conscience is absolutely correct.

In conclusion Karpov cites the following figures to confirm the fact that the people believe their writers and want to read them. NOVYY MIR's subscription readership has increased from 500,000 to 1.5 million, DRUZHBA NARODOV's from 250,000 to more than 1 million, ZNAMYA's has trebled, and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has gained 1 million new subscribers.

OGONEK Article on Young Writers Criticized
PM011014 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88
Second Edition p 6

[Anatoliy Salutskiy article under the rubric "From the Latest Mail": "Let Us Talk Seriously"]

[Text] In issue No 2 of the magazine OGONEK a long article entitled "Greetings, Young and Unknown Tribe" was published under the rubric "Polemical Notes." Judging by the headline and taking into account that the article was written by the well known writer of the older generation Nataliya Ilna, you might assume that the magazine had decided to discuss seriously the complex problems of literature by young writers. But on looking at the article the reader immediately discovers that he is not dealing with a detailed analysis, but rather with the vituperative pamphlet genre. Why and for what reason is Nataliya Ilna indignant with young writers?

But let us not take up the caustic tone of the article, let us talk seriously. To this end it should be said first of all that, denying the existence of the very concept of literature by young writers and claiming that "there has never been any such category in Russia," Ilna slips into an error that is unforgivable in one of her experience. You

only need to reread Gorkiy's famous article "On Literature" to see how much attention Gorkiy devoted specifically to young literature, to young writers.

We know that new writers sometimes tend to be too categorical in their opinions. The concern of the older generation is wisely to cultivate breadth of vision in them. Alas, Nataliya Ilina, who, in her book of memoirs, repeatedly reproaches herself for her heated opinions in her youth, does not forgive the young generation such opinions. Without presenting a whole picture of young writers' literature in all its diversity, she dismisses wholesale today's 40-year-olds, concluding that "new forces have not joined fully in the struggle for the right to write." The article can only be assessed as a slander on young writers. OGONEK has given a lesson in dealing sharply with creative differences of opinion.

Nor, in my view, does the author spare those who have educated the "young tribe." Here some even more serious questions arise. Why this desire to stir up trouble between literary generations? For whom is Ilina clearing the way if, on the one hand, she tears down the acknowledged literary authorities, and on the other, she expresses distrust in the young and, moreover, sets one group against the other on the basis of publishers' "page counts"?

The author tries, in particular, to overthrow the authorities with the help of publishing statistics and the supposed piles of unsold books. The word "supposedly" is here used intentionally. As for ROMAN-GAZETA, subscriptions this year increased by exactly 1 million copies—how is that for unsold piles? In the recent television program "Standpoint" an experienced bibliographer from the Lenin Library said that the leaders in terms of demand among readers are undoubtedly P. Proskurin, G. Markov, A. Ivanov, and Yu. Semenov—precisely the writers (apart from Yu. Semenov) whom Nataliya Ilina castigates.

She makes a particular effort with regard to G. Markov, making use of the fact that in his father's old home his fellow villagers have opened a little museum. I have been to Tomsk Oblast more than once and I too have heard about the famous taiga hunter Mokey Markov. So why should his fellow countrymen not open a museum of hunting rifles? And why should that museum not contain books written by the hunter's son, the well known writer Georgiy Markov? Moreover he presented his Lenin Prize to his native village to set up a library. What is so seditious about that? And why is it necessary to wax ironical about the review by a Tomsk journalist who is proud of her fellow countryman and pleased that the Siberian hunter's former hut has become the first literary museum in the oblast?

Once again, let us recall Gorkiy's article "On Literature," which certain editors ought to reread. It also contains these lines: "It is extremely strange and very sad

to see disputes among people who are basically likeminded being conducted in a hostile tone and marked by the grossest personal attacks, and to see the lack, in these disputes, of a sense of comradeship and awareness of unity in the main line. Mutual accusations of distortions, of a dishonest attitude to thoughts and words, the desire to injure your opponent above and below the belt, blatant hints at his thoughtlessness, and other crushing methods of verbal warfare are hardly praiseworthy or necessary for people who have chosen the profession of 'teachers of life' in the country where socialist culture is being built."

I have reread Nataliya Ilina's article. No, it can in no way serve to confirm the ideas voiced by OGONEK's chief editor at the recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke of the need to consolidate creative forces, the need for a climate of trust. The question arises: "Is there not a discrepancy here between word and deed?"

Economic

Letters on Discipline, Approaches of Reforms

PM020954 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 88
Morning Edition p 2

[Review of readers' letters by Yuriy Orlik, IZVESTIYA deputy editor for letters, under the rubric "Reading the Mail": "January, the Beginning: Reform Comes to the Plants"]

[Text] This article will discuss letters that are in some way connected with the economic reform that is taking place in the country. This is not an analysis of successes and failures—it is more an impression of the first steps of the restructuring in production.

Nobody doubts the necessity for it: "It is good that we have lived to see the day when socialism, the national economy, and man are linked together in a single whole," L. Volobuyev writes from Tyumen. "At last we have realized that the economy should be the economy, should develop according to its own laws, and not 'at my will, at my behest'"—these lines are from a letter from construction workers' team leader A. Pachaidze from Kutaisi.

Readers write that "economic accountability disciplines both leaders and workers" (K. Sarantsev, Vologda), that it "teaches us not to hope that they will terminate the contract all the same" (A. Selikhov, Brest), "hits idlers and good-for-nothings" (A. Chichibaba, Ust-Ilimsk), and "makes us think first, and then act" (L. Vykukholev, Kashka-Darya Oblast). But of course, there are more letters about the difficulties encountered in the course of the transition to new economic management methods. The critical orientation of the mail should not disturb us: As a rule people write to the newspapers when something is not going well, not when everything is as it should. Here is a typical letter. "Not so long ago a contract for

the construction of a plant shop was signed between our—economically accountable! comprehensive!—team and the administration,” V. Tozarev’s team of installation workers and steplejacks from the Ryazselmash plant writes to the editorial office. “This shop is a Polish-made prefabricated storage module. It has been at the plant since 1983, it was poorly preserved and the structures were warped. We started work energetically, we did not count up our personal time, we came in every Saturday and Sunday. We knew we were working for ourselves. We thought our time had really come, the time when the working man can be rewarded in full for his work. But after 2 months they docked our wages, they immediately cut the estimate by 50%, and the explanation they gave was that we had started to earn too much.”

The restructuring of economic relations is difficult precisely because it cannot begin from a clean slate. The line between 31 December and 1 January is hypothetical, although it was on that day that the majority of the country’s enterprises went over to economic accountability and self-financing. The burden of the past hampers our progress.

Readers write with concern that in the new economic management conditions enterprise leaders “keep afloat not through efficient organization of production, but through the sweated labor system” (A. Melnikov, Voronezh). “I am a furnace charge operator at the Sukhlozhskiy refractory production unit (Sverdlovsk Oblast),” T. Miniakhmetov writes to the editorial office. “Today we hear on all sides: Money must be earned, nobody will give it to you just like that. They increase the output norms. We could put up with all that, what is worrisome is the injustice because we also have to work for those who sit in the offices in the guise of fitters, pressers, and so forth.” “People are worn out by working overtime, by ‘black Saturdays’ at the request of the administration and on the minister’s orders, to which that defender of the working class, the trade union, so willingly gives its consent, as is required by protocol,” G. Lavrinenko of Dnepropetrovsk observes. “When you try to protest, you are besieged: We won’t fulfill the plan, we’ll be ruined...”

The system of the three “S’s” [self-administration, self-financing, self-capitalization] is a fairly tough system, it does not tolerate any parasitism—that is well expressed in T. Miniakhmetov’s letter. Economic accountability, if it is implemented fully and consistently, is incompatible with overblown staffing levels or the tendency to divert people to other work and to conferences and sessions. Economic reform also requires different approaches to social activity. We received a characteristic letter from workers at the “Altaysvinetsstroy” trust in Ust-Kamenogorsk. The letter encloses an appeal from the “triumvirate” [“treugolnik”; colloquial term for the leaders of the administration, party organization, and trade union organization] to the labor collective council with the request that, in view of the large burden of public work

borne by part-time secretaries of party and Komsomol organizations and chairmen of trade union committees, the payments to them from the collective fund be increased. “Can it be right for wage supplements to be demanded for the fulfillment of public commissions?” the authors of the letter ask.

A reasonable question, but I would like to draw attention to this detail: The once omnipotent “triumvirate” today asks the permission of the labor collective council. Their activity is described in many letters in our mail. Alas, often the comments are critical. O. Anisimov, chief specialist at the “Ukryuzhgiprokommunistroy” Institute (Odessa), appends to his letter “a breakdown of our council by the posts held.” Of 30 people, 26 are leaders at various levels. Recalling what was said at the 27th CPSU Congress to the effect that management must not be the privilege of a small group of professionals, O. Anisimov observes: “How will a session of the council elected by our collective (incidentally, they were elected by means of a list, without discussion of candidacies) differ from the ordinary production planning conference in the institute director’s office?” “Such a council will be a mere appendage to the power of the administrative leader,” Candidate of Economic Sciences G. Vyatkin, lecturer at the Kuban State University (Krasnodar), writes. “Contradictions between the labor collective and the administration have always existed and will continue to exist, and we must resolve them skillfully to the benefit of the common cause.”

That is by no means always what happens. “There are no elections at our plant,” A. Botsmanov and others, workers at the Kurskagropromstroy ferroconcrete articles plant, write, “we work in the old way, much of the equipment is broken, we do everything by hand. Yet we are on the threshold of the 21st century. We started getting indignant, making demands and asking for what we need to do our work, and in reply we got shouts, reproaches, threats: ‘If you don’t want to work, clear off.’” L. Demchenko, senior engineer at Giprograd (Kiev), is not inclined to put all the blame for the state of affairs in the labor collective onto the bosses. “The most severe brake on the restructuring,” she writes, “is the slave mentality, the mentality of the cog, the little man: ‘I did what they told me.’ That is why it is so important for everyone to feel involved in the affairs of the restructuring, to feel he is in charge.” “The chief obstacle to the restructuring,” Ye. Sepetyy, an architect from Tashkent, says, agreeing with the author of that letter, “is not so much the bureaucrats who have found a comfortable place, as the inertia of the masses, whose psychology became warped in the time of stagnation.”

A large proportion of the editorial mail is associated with problems of the economic training of cadres. “Economic knowledge is the key to the restructuring of the economic mechanism,” says V. Laskin from Tolyatti. “All our troubles stem from economic ignorance, from the inability to reckon income and expenditure, from casually confident haste where the utmost caution is needed,” in

the opinion of S. Labutin from Blagoveshchensk. Engineer P. Belikov of the "Tsentrolit" plant (Sumy) writes that for the worker the most important thing is to "see a real link between his personal income and the income of the labor collective, the enterprise."

Judging from the mail, labor remuneration is certainly society's most sensitive economic nerve. Yes, the time has come when everything must be reckoned up and everything compensated. When wages must be earned. How important it is to make the principles of labor remuneration clear and comprehensible to every worker: If you do more, better work, you receive more for it. Alas, in the readers' perception, confusion and chaos prevail here. "The ministry issues us with a staff allocation which indicates the posts—from captain down to seaman—and the salaries and shares," A. Grechin, navigator at the Klaypeda refrigerator fleet base, writes. "The allocation is drawn up in such a way that nobody can surge forward in terms of wages. But—in the spirit of the restructuring—why not put the wage fund at the crew's disposal?... In general, we have had enough nursemaiding, it is time to give us a free hand, let us operate freely!"

A group of workers at the Oranzherei fish combine in Astrakhan Oblast (the letter has 15 signatures), by way of evidence that "arbitrary leadership methods" still prevail in the economy, cites the experience of their enterprise, where some 2,000 people work. "In practice," they write, "the enterprise collective has received: instead of autonomy—a strict system of planning from above, reinforced by the state order (which stands at 102% of the 1987 production plan); instead of an interest in the results of labor—deduction and redistribution of profit to low-profit and loss-making enterprises belonging to the 'Kaspryb' All-Union Fisheries Association; instead of the resolution of social tasks and the modernization of the enterprise—vague promises for the future, and one concrete decision, to suspend work on the construction of a 110-apartment block because of the lack of resources."

As you can see, there are many difficulties in the path of the implementation of economic reform. The clash between the new and the old, between the accustomed administrative decree methods of management and economically accountable principles of labor organization, gives a particular intensity and drama to our time. It is important not to deviate from our plans, from the beginning we have made. As L. Geydov, tower crane operator from Yoshkar-Ola, wrote in his letter, "we cannot go back. We have been there before."

Agricultural

Ligachev Addresses Stockraising Seminar
PM021155 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
31 Jan 88 p 2

[TASS report: "Party Must Pay Attention to Intensification of Feed Production and Livestock Raising"]

[Text] A seminar-conference involving the first secretaries of a number of union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms and chairmen of republic, kray, and oblast agro-industrial committees in the European zone of the country was held at the CPSU Central Committee on 29-30 January. It examined questions concerned with the organization of party work designed to ensure the further intensification of feed production and stockraising and increased livestock production on this basis.

The following took part in the seminar-conference's work: V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye.K. Ligachev, and V.P. Nikonov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo members; G.P. Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee secretary; V.S. Murakhovskiy, USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman; S.I. Manyakin, USSR People's Control Committee chairman; senior officials of the apparatuses of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR and RSFSR Council of Ministers; and scientists from the V.I. Lenin All-union Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

Reports on party organizations' work in increasing food production on the basis of intensifying feed production and stockraising were delivered by V.K. Mesyats, Moscow CPSU Obkom first secretary, and Yu.A. Manayenkov, Lipetsk CPSU Obkom first secretary.

N.I. Strekozov, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Animal Husbandry; V.G. Iglovikov, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Feed; and I.A. Sikorskiy, director of the Kurgan Scientific Research Institute for the Grain Industry; reported on the basic thrusts and results of scientific research into problems of feed production and stockraising. K.V. Kunitskiy, general director of the "Ramenskiy" Agro-Industrial Combine, spoke about the experience of his combine.

The participants in the seminar-conference were briefed on the work of the party organizations and labor collectives of the stockraising units of the "Shchapovo" experimental farm, Leninskiy Rayon's M. Gorkiy Kolkhoz, and Krasnogorkiy Rayon's "Zavet Iliche" Kolkhoz in applying intensive techniques and progressive forms of labor organization and incentives in the sector, economic accountability, and self-financing.

In Podolsk they visited a meat combine and dairy products plant, where they were shown new Soviet equipment that provides an intensive, waste-free technique for processing stock unit output and a wide range of enterprises' products.

The seminar-conference's results were summed up in a speech delivered by Ye.K. Ligachev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member.

Our party, he said, has entered a new phase in restructuring, its most difficult phase—the phase of implementing the policy of restructuring in practice and turning it

into a real working system whose aim is to considerably enhance Soviet people's standard of material and spiritual life. People and their interests have always been and remain the focus of party policy. Everything that has been done and still remains to be done must be assessed from this standpoint. The steady provision of high-quality goods and varied food products to the country's population figure among our urgent priorities. This question is constantly on the agenda, and progress is being made in solving it.

In the last 2 years alone the country recorded increases in average annual output compared with the last 5-year plan of 17% for grain, 11% for sugar beet, 14% for sunflowers, 13% for meat, and 9% for milk and eggs. There have been improvements. In objectively assessing what has been done, however, it must be openly acknowledged that we are still as yet unable to fully meet Soviet people's needs today for varied high-quality foodstuffs, particularly animal-based ones.

The CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum set the task of substantially improving the population's food supply in the next 2-3 years. In its decision the CPSU Central Committee assigns the main role here to organizational and economic factors—the new management mechanism, the restructuring of production relations in the agro-industrial complex, new forms of labor organization and incentives, economic accountability, and self-financing. Everything, that is, that galvanizes people's social and labor activeness. Further growth in and retooling of the material base of agriculture and the processing sphere are no less important.

But the main thing, and this was clearly stated in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, is the need to boost the efficiency with which existing production potential is used and concentrate efforts and resources on the most important areas, those which yield the highest return. This task is particularly pressing in stock-raising, a sector whose results today considerably determine the solution of the food question. In the last 10 years the growth rates of fixed production capital there have considerably outstripped the increase in the output of livestock products. The reason is that the strengthening of the technical base was out of touch with feed production.

This obliges us to examine carefully once again agricultural investment policy. Experience insists that priority be given to capital investment in feed production facilities. It is now essential to primarily direct efforts and resources toward the all-around intensification of the sector—boosting livestock and poultry productivity primarily through the consolidation of the feed base and better utilization of forage.

Recently adopted measures are having a beneficial effect on increasing the volume of procurements and enhancing the quality of coarse and succulent feed, which has made it possible not only to boost the output of livestock production but also reduce the consumption of grain for feed purposes.

The volume and particularly the quality of feed procured, however, are still not ensuring the requisite growth rates for livestock production. On many kolkhozes and sovkhozes the situation is improving only slowly. Livestock productivity remains low. This particularly applies to farms in the Dagestan ASSR and Astrakhan, Kalinin, Novgorod, Pskov, Ivanovo, Yaroslavl, Kursk, Rostov, and certain other oblasts and republics. Party committees and agro-industrial organs of many of them put up with a feed production shortfall. Quite often they adopt a parasitic stance and continue the unsuitable practice of draining feed from state resources.

After analyzing the state of feed production and the development of stockraising in republics, krais, and oblasts, the CPSU Central Committee secretary dwelt on the basic thrusts of the work of party and economic organs in consolidating the feed base chiefly through the reserves at the disposal of each kolkhoz, sovkhoz, rayon, and oblast.

This is primarily a question of ensuring a further increase in the yield of feed crops on arable land and, in particular, on reclaimed land. In many areas field feed production is being developed predominantly by extensive means, mainly through increasing the area of feed crop sown with no increase in yield. This is typical of most farms and sovkhozes in Kalinin, Pskov, and Kirov Oblasts and the Chechen-Ingush ASSR.

Great variations in feed yield are recorded by neighboring oblasts and republics with identical natural conditions. On farms in Kirov Oblast, for example, the yield of a field sown for feed is almost half that in Gorkiy and Kursk Oblasts, one-third less than in Belgorod Oblast and the Dagestan ASSR, and almost 60% less than in the North Osetian ASSR.

Ye.K. Ligachev drew attention to the need to improve the use of natural feed land, from which it is planned to obtain roughly half the targeted increase in the production of coarse and succulent feed. However, this very important reserve is still being underutilized. The productivity of natural feed land is several times lower than that of cultivated feed output as a result of the poor state of reclamation work. Work to fundamentally improve natural hayfields and pasture in Astrakhan, Kursk, Kaluga, Ryazan, and Kostroma Oblasts and the Kalmyk and Chuvash ASSR's is seriously lagging. Work to fundamentally improve meadows and pasture must be intensified, and a considerable part of the resources of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and reclamation organizations directed to this end. Greater attention must be paid to enhancing feed quality. Unfortunately, this work is not being given due attention on many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the RSFSR's North, Northwest, and Central Regions, the Ukraine, Moldavia, and in the Baltic republics. Progressive techniques for procuring feed—the

forced drying of hay and the application of chemical preservatives and bacterial yeasts—are being introduced too slowly on farms in Orlov and Smolensk Oblasts.

Rostov, Tula, Tambov, Zaporozhye, and Kharkov Oblasts are poorly provided with facilities for storing hay and other feed.

The nutritional value of feed is not universally assessed during the process of procurement and storage, which quite often leads to distortion of the true state of affairs regarding feed provision for livestock. It is not just tonnes of hay and silage but tonnes of high-protein feed units that are needed.

The problem of providing stockraising with feed protein is particularly acute. Feed that is unbalanced in terms of protein and amino acids, particularly lysines, has an adverse effect upon the productivity of livestock and poultry and leads to excess feed consumption.

Scientific research and extensive production experience make it possible to draw the conclusion that we can and must solve this acute problem through our own resources. For this it is important to increase the production of protein feed by increasing the sown areas of pulse crops, oil-bearing crops, and perennial grasses and by making greater use of the waste products of the processing industry and the products of microbiological synthesis.

Party committees must monitor the work of mixed feed enterprises' party organizations and pay special attention to ensuring that technological discipline is observed and the quality of mixed feed improved. It is time to earnestly get down to introducing the system of state acceptance for mixed feed.

The successful development of the feed base depends to a considerable extent on extensive assimilation of advanced forms of labor organization and remuneration in feed production. The task is to give special status to feed production, to create detachments and teams on every farm, to provide them with all essentials, and to switch to the contract system and genuine economic accountability.

It is necessary to comprehensively organize the training of cadres in the fundamentals of intensive feed production. It is necessary to train everyone, above all farm leaders and specialists, the middle tier, and machine operators, and to provide relevant training based on the examples of the best kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

It is recommended that questions connected with creating a firm feed base be examined without delay by primary party organizations and party committees at all levels.

This year all kolkhozes and sovkhozes are to increase coarse and succulent feed production by 4-5 quintals of feed units per standard head of livestock in comparison

with last year. Only thus is it possible to consolidate what has been achieved and to further increase the production of livestock products at a rapid rate.

Ye.K. Ligachev dwelt on the development of citizens' personal subsidiary plots and subsidiary farms belonging to industrial enterprises and organizations. Due attention is not being paid to this area of work in Ulyanovsk, Tambov, Nikolayevsk, and a number of other oblasts. Insufficient hayfields, pastures, feed concentrate, construction materials, and young animals and poultry are being allocated to personal plots in those places. Matters should be organized to ensure that everyone who wants to engage in livestock production on personal plots is provided with young animals and feed with the assistance of public-sector production. Party, soviet, and economic organs must conduct all this work in a purposeful and organized manner. This will make it possible to substantially increase the country's food resources.

One of the main ways of intensifying and increasing the efficiency of stockraising together with reinforcing the feed base is through production specialization and concentration and by transferring production to a modern industrial footing. There is tremendous potential here, as experience has shown. The existing plans for the specialization and concentration of stockraising should be reviewed, the appropriate adjustments made to them in light of new opportunities, experience, and scientific and technical progress, and steady progress achieved in implementing them.

It is also necessary to monitor the construction of enterprises for the processing of livestock, milk, and other livestock produce.

In stockraising now it is important not only to maintain the existing rate of growth in meat, milk, and other production but also to considerably increase it. That must be the aim of the activity of party, soviet, and economic organs and labor collectives from the very first months of the year. Work results depend to a large extent on how successfully livestock wintering is completed. In a number of places at the moment, however, it is disorganized. Meat and milk production on farms in Pskov, Kostroma, Yaroslavl, and Kirov Oblasts fell in the 4th quarter of last year compared with the same period the year before. There are quite a few shortcomings on farms in other oblasts and republics.

The preparation for spring field work now requires close attention. No time must be lost, additional measures must be taken to speed up seed preparation, and equipment repair and cadre training must be completed on time. It is important now to step up organizational work in labor collectives so as to mobilize them to fulfill the tasks contained in the CPSU Central Committee Letter to Machine Operators and the Central Committee Appeal to Stockraisers, to take additional measures to

improve their working conditions, and to be more prompt in resolving questions of medical, trade, consumer, and cultural services.

When organizing socialist competition it is necessary to work ceaselessly to increase its effectiveness. Questions of livestock wintering and preparation for spring sowing must be constantly publicized in the local press and in radio and television programs.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary dwelled on the tasks facing party committees and economic organs in connection with the transfer of agro-industrial complex enterprises to economic accountability and self-financing. It was stressed that this is not only of economic importance but also of tremendous social importance, too, because it has a direct bearing on the vital interests of millions of people. That is why we should regard the implementation of the measures involved in the transfer to new conditions as one of the central areas of party committees' work in the countryside.

Party organs' attention must be directed toward restructuring the attitude of cadres and of each worker. They must realize there is no alternative to full economic accountability and self-financing as methods of economic management. It is important that everyone—from the sovkhoz director and kolkhoz chairman to the machine operator and milkmaid—understands that the economic and social development of the collective and each person's individual prosperity are indissolubly connected with the end results of the enterprise's work and with the economically accountable income and profits earned.

The work begun is a complex matter and will take a number of years to complete. Thus we all have to accustom ourselves to the long, painstaking, and difficult work ahead. It is necessary to persistently train cadres not only in the fundamentals but also in the fine details of the new style of economic management.

When working to implement the economic reform in the countryside party organs must be knowledgeable and show a sense of urgency, resourcefulness, and persistence. They must instill in every worker and above all in Communists a sense of being true master and a striving for enterprise, thrift, and intolerance toward mismanagement and indiscipline.

The financial state of economically weak farms require the daily concern of party committees and economic organs. It is very important not to overlook the development of their material base, social provision, the solution of the housing question, and their reinforcement with skilled cadres. Each enterprise making either a low profit or a loss needs an individualized approach and the elaboration and implementation of a package of appropriate organizational, technical, and economic measures in which labor collectives themselves must be involved.

All organizational and political work in the countryside, Ye.K. Ligachev said in conclusion, must be directed toward accelerating the solution of the food question and of ensuring a steady food supply to the population. Soviet people pin their hopes for the success of the restructuring policy on this.

Agrarian Economist's Anniversary Marked

PM021207 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
2 Feb 88 p 3

[Report by M. Zarayev: "Chayanov and the Present Day; Notes from All-Union Scientific Theory Conference"]

[Text] Frankly, I had never before attended scientific conferences where historians, literary critics, and art historians mounted the rostrum together with academicians of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences [VASKHNIL]. But so vivid is the personality of the man whose birth centenary was being marked by this meeting and so diverse was his activity not only as an agrarian economist but also as a writer, historian, and collector, that representatives of culture were entirely at home here next to figures of agrarian economic science.

Many of those assembled recently took part in the celebrations to mark the centenary of Nikolay Ivanovich Vavilov. It is hard to avoid analogies. For all the difference in the direction of their research I could see much in common between the two scientists—in their scope, prophetic depth, their encyclopedic knowledge, their interests, and their tragic destiny. They were born and died at approximately the same time and lived in the same environment.

Two contradictory feelings gripped those assembled: pride that our fatherland can produce such people and bitterness that their lives were broken off prematurely and violently and that their works remained in oblivion for so long.

The present day constantly entered into the talk. That was natural. The works of Aleksandr Vasilyevich Chayanov are very closely linked with our present-day concerns.

"What can we take from Chayanov's legacy to place in the arsenal of present-day restructuring with its radical economic reform?" the keynote speaker, VASKHNIL President A.A. Nikonov, asked. He replied:

"Above all the priority given to man, to the primary labor collective, as Chayanov did, focusing his research on the working peasant farm.

"How infinitely far removed the middle peasant family of the twenties with its plot of land and its single horse would seem to be from the modern kolkhoz collective of intensive labor operating a combine or powerful tractor

on its contracted field. Nonetheless they do have something in common. It is a sense of being the master of the field, which the peasant of the twenties had no matter how hard his life and which we are seeking to resurrect in today's rural worker after all the complex turns in our history."

"Turning a worker into an owner-worker, resurrecting that inextricable duality—that is what is important now," A.M. Yemelyanov, corresponding member of VASKHNIL, stressed in his speech.

The 882 Siberian intensive labor collectives who have sensed they are the masters of their affairs and have drastically increased their labor productivity are only the first swallow, the harbinger of the complex and difficult process of restructuring production relations in the country's agro-industrial complex. These relations must be studied with Chayanov's honesty and thoroughness.

Much of what we have lost in attempts to achieve our goals at a stroke, much of what we have "rushed by" without heeding the specialists' warnings, we are now having to restore. It was once believed that the kolkhoz, as the supreme level of agricultural cooperation, as it were abolished and eliminated all other forms—the wholesale selling, processing, and credit forms of cooperation. Still fresh in our memory are the times when the kolkhozes were forbidden to engage in industrial enterprise and the primary processing of raw material, the belief being that they would thus supplant the functions of state industry. Chayanov urged that the various cooperative forms should not be set against each other but combined, using one criterion in their selection—the least prime cost of the product obtained.

The idea which he put forward in the twenties for combines for the initial processing of agricultural products and the technical equipping of the rayon was perhaps ahead of its time, yet now we see in this combine the prototype of the modern rayon agro-industrial association.

Life today is putting forward ever new types of agro-industrial associations—production and science and production associations, agricultural firms, and agricultural combines. Their work is in need of theoretical generalization and substantiation. Not allowing science to lag behind, not beginning, to use Chayanov's words, to tag along behind the cooperative movement—that was the idea heard at the conference. VASKHNIL Academician V.R. Boyev showed how rapidly the enlargement of collective farms proceeded. While in 1928 the average kolkhoz had 13 households in 1940 the figure was 81, in 1950 it was 165, and in 1985 it was 497. There has been a corresponding increase in land use and livestock population. What was the motive force of this giantism? Most frequently, the desire to use enlargement to cover up shortcomings in the planning and organization of

production. The mass and sometimes unjustified transformation of kolkhozes into sovkhozes? What is there here except the desire for the uniformity of the form of ownership?

Chayanov understood very well the advantages of large-scale production. He was responsible for the initiative in siting grain factories in the virgin land regions of the North Caucasus, the Volga Region, the South Urals and partially in North Kazakhstan. But he was also responsible for the theory of differentiated optimums whose thrust was that the different mechanical, biological, and economic processes in agriculture and consequently agricultural enterprises should have their own optimum regimes and dimensions.

It is impossible to enlarge enterprises without considering all factors of economic management and, of course, primarily the human factor. That is not an arbitrary or administrative task but a socioeconomic one. A person who works on the land should be close to it, at the same time coordinating various sectors of his production to the optimum size. It is no accident the conference stated that the kolkhoz and the sovkhoz may in the course of restructuring be turned into a cooperative of primary labor collectives operating on a contract basis.

Whichever aspect of A.V. Chayanov's very rich creative legacy those assembled touched on, everything directed them to modern associations, to the realities of the present day. The scientist studied the economy of water supplies. This work is becoming topical now in connection with the water shortage in a number of regions and the need to pay for water.

Regional problems. Back in 1918, analyzing the life of the northern peasant farm, Chayanov sounded the alarm over the depopulation of the Russian non-Chernozem and insisted on the universal introduction of clover crop rotations, the development of meat and dairy livestock raising, the spread of basic industries, and all this on a cooperative basis. Now that capital investments in the agrarian sector of the non-Chernozem over the past 15 years have failed to lead to a fundamental improvement of matters, it is more important than ever to use the small-group, family rental, forms of contract, expanding and improving the cooperative links of primary labor collectives.

The discussion of the scientific legacy of Aleksandr Vasilyevich Chayanov in light of present-day tasks lasted 2 days—29 and 30 January. Taking part in the work of the conference were V.S. Murakhovskiy, USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman and USSR Gosagroprom chairman, and responsible workers of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR Gosagroprom.

Media Report 28-31 Jan Agricultural Developments

LD020155 [Editorial report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 28-31 January. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

28 January

The Ukrainian agroprom is going to supply 12,000 machines for the application of fertilizers and a vast amount of additional machinery for the industrial technology of conducting agricultural work at farms by the start of the spring sowing season. The sowing is to be carried out on the acreage of almost 20 million hectares, and the seeds for it are completely ready. A correspondent reports that new, highly productive varieties and hybrids will be sown on about 6 million hectares. (0500)

29-31 January

No fileworthy items monitored.

Military

Kurkotkin, Others on 'Beneficial' Restructuring

PM021527 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
30 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Colonel V. Kostko report under the rubric "Party Life: Reports on Progress of Restructuring": "Things Are Still Going Slowly..."]

[Excerpts] Southern Group of Forces—over the past 2 years the Southern Group of Forces has held more than a dozen varied events, but—let me be frank—I have never seen preparations as thorough as those for the present party aktiv meeting. There were many new and unusual things in these preparations. For instance, the group's newspaper LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA published the report's main propositions ahead of time....

Restructuring has inspired the overwhelming majority of Communists and all the personnel, and this is starting to have a beneficial impact on work—that was the conclusion drawn at the meeting in the report by Major General R. Gorelov, Military Council member and Southern Group of Forces Political Directorate chief. [passage omitted]

Speaking at the party aktiv meeting, Colonel General A. Demidov, Southern Group of Forces commander, talked about the measures which must be taken by the military council, the political directorate, commanders, political organs, and party, Komsomol, and trade union organizations to give a major fillip to the struggle for strong discipline. Everyone must adopt the same approach: There has been enough toleration of cases of trouble or specific work being undermined by "gross" indicators or surface gloss. [passage omitted]

The topic of officers' authority and their closeness to their subordinates was keenly discussed at the meeting. Special attention was devoted to this topic by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and USSR Armed Forces Rear Services chief. "Father" was what commanders were called during his years at the front, and they used to give pride of place to fatherly concern for their men. Commanders such as these will not vanish into their tents for dinner if they know their men have not eaten. Under no circumstances will they go to sleep before making sure each of their subordinates has settled down for the night. The road to servicemen's hearts often lies through their leisure and real concern about them. It should not be forgotten that leisure applies not only to the consumption sphere, it is a political concept.

A discordant note in respect of these words was struck by an incident cited by Major General A. Sepelnikov during his contribution to the debate. Lieutenant V. Veretelnikov, chief of the food service with a certain battalion, had accumulated 12 reprimands during...just 1 year of service as an officer. When a senior officer made a thorough investigation of the reasons for such an anomaly, 10 of the reprimands were annulled as groundless.

The debate also touched on other important questions linked with the forthcoming work at the second stage of restructuring. The meeting was an important component in the preparations of the Group's Communists for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Lieutenant General V. Lukinykh, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate's Organizational Party Work Directorate, and O. Fedyunin, senior worker at the CPSU Central Committee Administrative Organs Department, took part in the meeting's work.